

CHURCH ORDERS:

u^D

—OR—

THE NECESSITY OF A RIGHT CALL TO THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTRY.

A LECTURE UPON THE FOURTEENTH ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG
CONFESSION.

BY L. A. GOTWALD, D. D.,
YORK, PENN'A.

[FROM THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, OCTOBER, 1879.]



GETTYSBURG:

J. E. WIBLE PRINTER, COR. OF WASHINGTON AND NORTH STREETS.
1879.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

CHURCH ORDERS:

—OR—

THE NECESSITY OF A RIGHT CALL TO THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTRY.*

In looking at the catalogue of distinguished persons who, in this course of Lectures, have addressed you upon the successive Articles of our precious *Confessio Augustana*, I feel an unaffected diffidence in now appearing before you. The importance also of the subject, and the limited time for its consideration which, amid the unceasing duties of a large pastoral work, I have been able to command, intensify that diffidence.

Through the partiality, however, of my brethren who constitute the Board of Directors of this Seminary, I have been chosen to discharge this duty, and hence, bowing to their judgment in the matter, and waiving my own, I assume the labor and proceed to address you upon *The Fourteenth Article of The Augsburg Confession*.

THE TEXT OF THE ARTICLE.

Article XIV. of the Augsburg Confession reads as follows:

“De ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus.”—*Müller, Symbolischen Bücher*, p. 42.

“Vom Kirchen Regiment wird gelehrt, das niemand in der Kirchen öffentlich lehren oder predigen, oder Sacrament reichen soll ohne ordentlichen Beruf.”—*Müller*, p. 42.

* Fourteenth Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., by L. A. Gotwald, D. D., May 19th and 20th, 1879.

“Concerning Ecclesiastical Orders [Church Government], they teach that no man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the Sacraments, except he be rightly called [without a regular call].”—*Schaff's Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 3, p. 15.

Both the Latin and the German texts of the “*editio princeps*,” 1531, underwent subsequently, by different hands, certain slight changes and emendations. The Codex Nurembergensis, *e. g.*, has “*vocatis*” for “*vocatus*.” The “*editio Variata*” (1540 et 42) adds also the words: “*Sicut et Paulus præcipit Tito, ut in civitatibus Presbyteros constituat*,” (Tit. 1: 5 sq.); an addition which was not, it is true, absolutely necessary, but which still, as an exposition of the final clause of the Article, serves a most useful purpose. For, as Bilmar (*Die Augsburger Confession Erklärt von A. F. C. Bilmar, weiland Professor der Theologie zu Marburg*, p. 129) properly remarks concerning it: “Ein Satz, der zwar an sich nicht nötig, aber zur erläuterung des *rite vocatus* doch sehr dienlich ist.”

In the German text Spalatin inserts, after the word “*gelehrt*,” the additional words “*und gepredigt*,” making the first clause read: “Vom Kirchen-regiment wird gelehrt und gepredigt.” In the Anspacher deutsche Handschriften, No. 2, the final phrase “*ohne ordentlichen Beruf*,” is transposed and inserted already after the word “*niemand*,” so as to read “Vom Kirchen-regiment wird gelehrt das niemand ohne ordentlichen Beruf in der Kirchen öffentlich lehren oder predigen, oder Sacrament reichen soll.” Spalatin also substitutes the words “*oder auch die*” for the single word “*oder*” just before “*predigen*.” And he also substitutes the words “*er sey denn zuvor dartzu ordentlich beruffen*,” for the words “*ohne ordentlichen Beruf*.”—*Vide Zöckler über Die Augsburger Confession*, pp. 244, 245.

These changes are all merely verbal, and do not, even in the slightest degree, affect the doctrinal sense of the Article.

THE HISTORICAL OCCASION OF THE ARTICLE.

This Article of the Confession occupies upon the subject of the ministry, concerning which it treats, a middle or con-

servative position. It stands midway between two extreme and equally false positions. Like a sharp double-edged sword, it cuts relentlessly into the errors of both.

The one extreme against which it thus stands opposed, and which it designedly and clearly condemns, is the Anabaptist or fanatical extreme, so prevalent in the days of the Reformation, which denied the very existence of the ministerial office, and which taught that all whom impulse might at any time, or in any way or place, move to it, were equally entitled to speak and be heard in the Church as religious teachers. Believing in what they called "the inward word or light," or "an immediate revelation," they held that the objective or written word was insufficient and ineffectual to enlighten, convert and sanctify man, (*Schott on Augs. Con.*, p. 87); proceeding even so far as to maintain that the Spirit of God *could not* work by means of any thing outer or external, and did not, in the least, bind Himself thus to work through the objective or external, (*Vide Plitt's Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, p. 172). Thus denying the necessity of the written *word*, as a means of grace, they logically, of course, also denied the necessity of a special *ministry* to preach that word. And hence, as we find, they loudly disowned the existence of such a thing as the ministerial office. They assailed the education of men for the ministry, holding that such education was unnecessary, since every true Christian was urged on by the Spirit of God, and was possessed of a superior inner wisdom. All Christians they asserted, were, by the direct revelation of God's will within them, brought into possession of the truth, and were both competent and authorized, at will, to proclaim that truth to others.

Against this fanatical spirit, thus ignoring both the written word and the ministry, as a special office to preach that word, Luther, from the beginning, set himself with unflinching and desperate earnestness, both by voice and pen assailing and denouncing it. In the year 1525, he issued his famous tract, entitled "*Die Himmlischen Propheten*," in which he utters against it his fiercest invectives. Nor did

he rest until, at last, it was suppressed and its power for evil broken. Speaking of the Scriptures as the divinely ordained instrumentality by which man is brought to a knowledge of sin, and afterward also of the saving grace of God through Christ, he says: "Im selben Wort kompt der Geist und giebt den Glauben, wo und welchem er will. Wer dir eine andre Ordnung furschlagt, da zweifel nicht es sei der Teufel," (*De Wette*, 2, 579).

And against this same extreme and fanatical spirit, is this Fourteenth Article of the *Confession* directed. Instead of ignoring the word and sacraments, it recognizes them as the sole and only channels or means of grace to man; and instead of denying the ministerial office, it boldly asserts and assumes it, and teaches who, and who only, shall fill it.

The Article, it may be noted, is negative in its statement. It says who shall *not* perform ministerial acts, *i. e.* who shall *not* preach the word, and who shall *not* administer the sacraments. But this statement of the doctrine negatively is really the expression of it in the strongest possible positive form. It is the emphatic declaration of the fact that there is an "*Ordo*," a special and sacred ministerial *office*, and that into this office no one shall dare to enter unless he be "rightly called" into it. The functions of the office, it declares, shall be discharged by those only who are in the office.

But this Article of the Confession is directed also, on the other hand, against another and opposite extreme concerning the ministry. Whilst so earnestly maintaining that there is an office of the ministry, it yet also, at the same time and with equal firmness, maintains that it is *only* an office. This Article, therefore, stands in open array against the teachings concerning the ministry of the Church of Rome, as well as against the fanatical Anabaptist spirit prevalent in the days of the Reformers. For Rome, as is well known, makes the ministry a priesthood, and the ministerial office she arrogantly exalts into a separate and superior ministerial order. (Vide "*Symbolism*," by J. A. Mœhler, D. D., pp. 311-316. Also "*Canones et Decreta Dogmatica Concilii Tridentini, De Sacramento Ordinis*.") Most inconsistently she makes little or

nothing of the written *word*, as a means of grace, but, at the same time, makes much, and almost every thing, indeed, of the visible or objective *sacraments*, which, rightly understood, are the visible and objective word. (Vide *Book of Concord, Apology*, p. 265.) She teaches (*Plitt's Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, p. 366, 367,) that justifying grace is imparted to man through the channel or medium of the sacraments. The primal source of this grace, she acknowledges, is Jesus Christ, who, seated at the right hand of the Father, is essentially the only Mediator. But this grace He does not impart directly and without means. On the contrary He has ordained an "*Order*" to whom He has granted authority in His stead, to administer the sacraments, and who serve as mediators between Him, the Head of the Church, and Christians, as members of the same. The bestowal of this authority thus to mediate grace from Christ to His people, in and through the sacraments, occurs only in what is itself a sacrament, viz. the sacrament of holy orders, or consecration to the priesthood, which can only be administered by a bishop. In or through this sacrament of consecration or priestly ordination, the person ordained receives, once for all, divine commission and authority to administer the sacraments, and through them to impart saving grace to those receiving them. And in order that they may always and rightly administer the sacraments, there is further in ordination imparted to them an indestructible priestly character, (*character indelibilis*) and there is then impressed upon them a distinctive and indelible official token or relation. Just as baptism distinguishes the baptized from those who are not baptized, so this character, imparted in ordination, divides the priesthood from the laity permanently and forever. The priesthood, by ordination, become a "*class*" or separate "*order*." They are lifted up by it above the great mass of other Christians, and placed in a range, not of official power merely, but of personal sanctity and superiority, far above them. To them only, as a special and distinct order, Christ gives the dispensing of sacramental grace, so that upon their mediating priestly services all Christians, if they wish to be saved, are entirely dependent,

and to their authority they must be implicitly subject. Especially is all this the case in view of the fact that the priest in ordination, as the highest and most sacred prerogative conferred by that sacrament, receives divine power, in the sacrifice of the Mass, to change the bread and the wine into the literal or real body and blood of Christ, and then to present them to God, as an acceptable offering for Christians, and as the highest possible act of worship. This power thus to offer the sacrifice of the Mass, the priest could not possess nor execute, had he not in ordination received also an especial call (*vocatio*) to execute it.

The Council of Trent distinctly declares: "If any one saith that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood; or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of Christ, and of forgiving and retaining sins; but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all: let him be anathema." And again: "If any one saith that order or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a kind of rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and of the sacraments: let him be anathema." (*Schaff's Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 2, p. 191. See, also, "*History of the Council of Trent, from the French of L. F. Bungener*," pp. 369-372.)

Such is the theory of the Church of Rome, both concerning the ministry itself and the call to it. The ministry is an order, and he only is in this order who has, by episcopal ordination, been placed in it.

Of this theory our Article XIV. of the Augsburg Confession is an emphatic refutation. It gives, upon its very face, a marked prominence to the public preaching or teaching of God's word, as the first and principal part of ministerial work, and it thus strikes a direct blow at the conception of the ministry as a priesthood, called or ordained simply or chiefly to offer sacrifices and to mediate between God and man. And whilst agreeing with the Church of Rome that

no one should publicly in the church preach the word or administer the sacraments unless he be rightly called, there is yet here, by no means, an admission, as claimed by the Romish Church, that those only *are* thus rightly called whom a Romish Bishop, as one of the successors of the Apostles, and *jure divino*, has ordained. On the contrary, the Article, with noble silence, assumes the negative of all such arrogant claims, and does not stoop even to enter a formal denial. Articles V. and XXVIII., however, in spirit at least if not in words, do deny it. The spirit also of the entire Confession, as also of the whole work of the Reformation, refutes it. For the Reformation, in its last analysis, was simply a sublime protest against this false and crushing sacerdotalism of Rome. The writings of the Reformers, also, and the Confessions throughout (*Apology*, VII. Eng. tr., p. 265) abound in refutations of this theory that ordination by the hands of a Romish Bishop, or by any episcopal hands, as an exclusive, divinely-conferred prerogative, alone constitutes a valid and true introduction of a man to the office and work of the ministry. Luther says: "Sacerdos in novo testamento non fit, sed nascitur, non ordinatur, sed creatur." (*Opp. Jena*, 2, p. 580). And Melancthon in the *Apology* (Art. XIV. *De Ordine Ecclesiastico*) expressly declares, in his exposition of this Article, that the Reformers, for the sake of peace, were most willing to assist in maintaining the old ecclesiastical regulations and episcopal government, that is, were willing to concede to receive ordination from the hands of Romish Bishops, provided they were to be recognized as bishops only in the New Testament sense of *pastor*, in which every minister of the gospel is a bishop, and provided it was mutually understood that their exercise of such episcopal functions in ordination was not *de jure divino*, but only *de jure humano*. The *Apology* reads as follows: "The Fourteenth Article in which we say that no one should be permitted to preach, or to administer the sacraments in the Church, except those only who are duly called, they accept, provided that we mean by this the call of priests, who are ordained or consecrated according

to the canons. On this subject we have several times declared in this convention, that we are most willing to assist in maintaining the old ecclesiastical regulations and episcopal government, which is called *canonica politia*, provided the bishops would tolerate our doctrine, and receive our priests. But the bishops have hitherto persecuted and murdered our ministers contrary to their own laws. Nor have we as yet been able to induce them to desist from this tyranny. Our opponents are, therefore, to blame that the bishops are not obeyed, and we are excused before God and all pious men. For since the bishops will not tolerate our divines, unless they reject the doctrine which we profess, and which we are bound before God to confess and maintain, we cannot recognize the bishops, and prefer to obey God, knowing that the Christian Church is wherever the word of God is correctly taught. Let the bishops see to it how they can answer for the distraction and devastation of the churches by such tyranny." (*Book of Concord*, Eng. trans., p. 267). The language, also, of the Smalcald Articles is very clear upon this point. Article X. (*De Initiatione, Ordine et Vocatione*) says: "If the bishops would discharge their office faithfully, and take due care of the Church and the Gospel, they might, for the sake of charity and tranquility, not however from necessity, be allowed the privilege of ordaining and confirming us and our preachers; yet with this condition, that all unchristian masking, mummary and jugglery should be removed. But since they neither are, nor wish to be, true bishops, but political lords and princes, who will neither preach nor teach, nor baptize, nor administer the sacrament, nor transact any work or office in the Church, but force, persecute and condemn those who are called to this office, the Church must not, on their account, remain destitute of ministers."

This Article of our Confession, therefore, is, as we before remarked, in its very essence, a firm protest not only against the unchurchly and destructive extreme which entirely ignores and disowns the ministerial office, but also against the opposite extreme of the Church of Rome which elevates the

office into a holy order or sacrament. The Article owes its very existence, indeed, in the Confession, to these two equally wrong and ruinous conceptions of the ministry which then prevailed and which still prevail. Mœhler (*"Symbolism,"* p. 315) speaking of this Fourteenth Article, says it is "an Article which in the Lutheran system is utterly unintelligible, and to which, therefore, we can assign no place therein." "It is too," he adds, "a consequence of the accidental character of this Article that it merely asserts that every teacher is to be called in a lawful manner, without at all determining in what this lawfulness consists." But the Article is not unintelligible. It is not accidental. It had, in the minds of the framers of the Confession, a specific and clearly defined purpose; and it occupies, in the Confession itself, a designed and important place. It was seen to be needed, and hence also was inserted. Article V. speaks of the office itself; and this Article teaches by whom, and by whom only, the functions of the office are to be exercised. *That* has reference to the object and nature of the ministry; *this* to the call to the ministry. *That* to the work; *this* to the workmen. And hence, also, the Article properly stands *in* the Confession just *where* it stands. For, the logical order of thought demands, not that it should come, as some might have supposed, immediately following Article V., but exactly where it does come—viz. after Article XIII., on "*The Use of the Sacraments,*" and just before Article XV., "*Of Church Rites and Ordinances.*"

THE SUBSTANTIAL HARMONY OF THIS ARTICLE WITH THE TEACHINGS OF OTHER PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS UPON THE SUBJECT OF THE MINISTRY.

But, whilst this Article of our Confession is thus utterly, in its spirit and scope, opposed to the Romish conception of the ministry, as also to the directly opposite or Anabaptist conception of it, it is yet pleasant to note that it is, upon this whole subject, in entire harmony with all the great historic Protestant Confessions which, since the days of the Reformation, have moulded the thought and the faith of

Protestant Christendom. All Protestant Creeds recognize the ministry as an office, and either assert or imply that no one should discharge the special and sacred functions of the office unless he be first rightly inducted into the office. Or, as Dr. Hodge, (*“Systematic Theology,”* vol. III., p. 514,) speaking upon the question of who should administer the sacraments, says: “Lutherans and Reformed agree in teaching, first, that the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend on anything in him who administers them; and, secondly, that as the ministry of the word and sacraments are united in the Scriptures, it is a matter of order and propriety that the sacraments should be administered by those only who have been duly called and appointed to that service.”

In entire accord, therefore, with the teachings of this Fourteenth Article of our Confession, which we are now considering, the language of the Westminster Confession (*Confession of Faith*, chap. xxvii., 4) is:

“There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ, our Lord, in the Gospel. That is to say, baptism and the Lord’s Supper; neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word, lawfully ordained.”

The Thirty-Nine Articles, also, of the Church of England, upon this matter of the necessity of a call to the ministry, as, indeed, upon almost every other point, simply echo the teachings of our Augsburg Confession. Article XXII. declares:

“It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.”

The First Helvetic Confession, also, composed by a number of Swiss divines, delegated and assembled for the purpose in the city of Basle, in the year 1536, and which was the first Confession which represented the faith of all the Reformed cantons of Switzerland, says:

“This office and this service of the ministry shall be entrusted to no one unless he has been first well instructed concerning the knowledge and will of God, blameless in piety and uprightness of life, and been found and recognized by the ministers and proper authorities of the Church to be earnest and zealous to advance the glory of the name of Christ.”—*Creeds of Christendom*, vol. III., p. 221.

The language also of the *Second Helvetic Confession*, drawn up by Henry Bullinger of Zürich, Zwingli's successor, first published in Latin in 1566, and which Hagenbach calls “*ein wahres dogmatisches Meisterstück*,” is equally emphatic upon this point of the necessity of a call to the ministry. It says, (chapter xviii., sec. 8, *De Ministris Ecclesiæ*):

“No one ought to assume to himself the honor of the gospel ministry, *i. e.* no one should receive it for himself as a mere gift of patronage, or by any trick or art, or by his own mere will. Ministers of the Church may be called and chosen in a lawful ecclesiastical election; *i. e.* they may be solemnly elected by the Church, or by those deputed by the Church for this purpose, in a proper and regular manner, without disorder, discord or contention. And those who are elected shall be ordained by the presbyters (*senioribus*), with a public charge or address, and with the laying on of hands. Hence we here condemn all those who run of their own accord, when they have neither been elected, sent, nor ordained. (Jer. 23 : 32). We condemn a ministry which is unqualified, and not instructed nor possessed of the gifts necessary for the pastoral office.”—*Creed's of Christendom*, vol. III., p. 280).

In the French Confession of Faith, also, prepared principally by Calvin, revised and approved by a Synod of Paris, in 1559, and adopted by the Synod of La Rochelle in 1517, there is this language upon the point before us:

“We believe that no person should undertake to govern the Church upon his own authority, but that this should be derived from elections, as far as it is possible, and as God will permit. And we make this exception especially because sometimes, and even in our own days, when the state of the

Church has been interrupted, it has been necessary for God to raise men in an extraordinary manner to restore the Church which was in ruin and desolation. But, notwithstanding, we believe that this rule must always be binding: that all pastors, overseers and deacons should have evidence of being called to their office.”—*Schaff’s Creeds of Christendom*, vol. III., p. 377.

And the same is taught, also, in all the other principal Confessions dating back to the Reformation period; *e.g.* in the First Scotch Confession (1560), in the Belgic Confession (1561), in the Irish Articles of Religion (1615), and in the Savoy Declaration (1658), as also in other Confessions of minor historical importance.

Hence, no matter how widely our different Protestant Confessions differ upon *other* points, and no matter how much each one of our various Protestant branches may in this day of laxity, both in doctrine and practice, disregard and violate its own Confession, it nevertheless is a fact that in this one point of the necessity of a regular call before assuming to exercise the office of the gospel ministry, they do all theoretically and with hearty unanimity agree, and do all with one accord hold and teach, in the words of this Fourteenth Article of our own Confession: “De ordine Ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in Ecclesia publice docere aut Sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus.”

THE HARMONY OF THIS ARTICLE WITH THE TEACHINGS OF GOD’S WORD.

But a question of greater importance concerning this Article of our Confession is, not whether it accords with the teachings of other Confessions, for they and it may possibly both, as uninspired and merely human productions, be wrong, but whether it accords with the teachings of the word of God. That alone is infallible. All Confessions are right in so far—and only in so far—as they agree with it and teach what it teaches. “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” (Isaiah 8 : 20). But, concerning the teach-

ings of the Sacred Scriptures upon the point under consideration, there can be no possible room for doubt. They are most explicit in declaring, both by example and precept, both by assertion and inference, that only he who has first been rightly called and inducted to the office of the ministry can, or dare with safety, assume the discharge of its functions. This is so repeatedly and specifically declared that it would be comparatively easy to fill pages with citations of passages, in the way of evidence; and a vastly harder task would be to quote even one instance where with divine approbation and blessing, men publicly proclaimed God's word or administered His ordinances unless they were first called and commissioned so to do. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." (1 Cor. 14 : 33).

Moses did not of his own accord assume the office of law-giver and leader of the people of Israel, but God called him to it when he spake to him out of the burning bush in the wilderness. (Ex. 3 : 10-18). Aaron entered the office of priest only when once he had received from the Lord, by the hands of Moses, his commission to enter upon it. "And the Lord said to Aaron, 'Go into the wilderness to meet Moses.' And he went, and met him in the mount of God, and kissed him. And Moses told Aaron all the words of the Lord who had sent him, and all the signs which He had commanded him." (Ex. 4 : 27-28). The Levitical Priesthood, also, was not a merely assumed human undertaking; but the tribe of Levi was separated by God Himself from all the other tribes, and, by special and solemn services of consecration, were devoted to their sacred duties. (Num. 3 : 5-13). The prophets, also, who were true prophets of God, were called and sent forth upon their prophetic mission, with clear and undeniable credentials. Some, it is true, at various times, assumed to prophesy in God's name, just as some do now, whom God did not send, and upon whom He denounces His severe displeasure. "I have not sent them, saith the Lord, yet they prophesy a lie in my name; that I might drive you out, and that ye might perish; ye, and the prophets that prophesy

unto you.” (Jer. 27 : 15). But God’s true prophets were all *called* to prophesy. God called, inspired, commissioned them. They ran because He sent them. Their message was the “burden of the Lord” to the people. And the people recognized them as thus being God’s prophets—men filling a special office—and consecrated, with authority, to a separate and holy work. Thus was Samuel, the head of the prophetic college, directly called. “The Lord called Samuel and he answered ‘Here am I.’” (1 Sam. 3 : 4). The “vision” which Isaiah saw and uttered, were visions which God revealed to him, and bade him make known. (Isaiah 1 : 1). Jeremiah’s commission predates even his birth: “Then the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, ‘Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.’” (Jer. 1 : 4–5). The same is true, also, of all the prophets: they did not prophesy until they were called and moved by God to do so. And not only did God thus, under the old dispensation, throw a sanctity around the priestly and prophetic offices by specially calling and endowing men to fill them, but He declared this sanctity in a yet more impressive manner, namely by the sudden and fearful displays of His displeasure with which He, on several occasions at least, visited those who, without being called and separated to the work, irreverently assumed the functions of these offices. “Thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons,” said God to Moses, “and they shall wait on their priest’s office; and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.” (Num. 3 : 10). When Miriam and Aaron murmured against Moses, and said, “Hath the Lord spoken only by Moses? hath He not spoken also by us?” the anger of the Lord was kindled against them, and when “the cloud departed from off the Tabernacle, behold Miriam was leprous white as snow.” (Num. 12 : 1–10). The case, also, of King Uzziah is a striking one in proof of God’s displeasure against those who dare to intrude themselves, uncalled, into the priestly or ministerial office. (2 Chron. 26 : 16–21). Very signally, also, did God display His displeasure against all unbidden or un-

called assumption of official and sacred duties, in the case of Uzzah, when the Ark was brought by David from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem. (2 Sam. 6 : 3-7). And similarly did He also show His anger against all such irreverent presumption when Jeroboam the son of Nebat, the wicked king who made Israel to sin, once stood by the Altar to burn incense. When the prophet denounced him for it, and he stretched out his hand to seize and punish the prophet, "his hand which he put forth against him, dried up so that he could not pull it in again to him." (1 Kings 12 : 1-4).

Examples, in proof of the position that only those who are rightly called should perform ministerial acts, abound also in the New Testament. The harbinger of the Messiah, John the Baptist, was "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb," to go before the coming Redeemer in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." (Luke 1 : 15-17). The Seventy had their commission directly from the Master, and were sent by Him, "two and two, into every city and place whither He himself would come." (Luke 10 : 1). So especially were the Twelve called and ordained to their special office. "And He called unto Him the Twelve and began to send them forth by two and two." (Mark 6 : 7). "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." (John 15 : 16). And so when Judas, one of these twelve, by transgression fell, his place, whether properly or not, was filled by the election of Matthias to the apostleship, thus showing at least that the Church of Jerusalem believed a "call" to the office necessary before assuming the duties of the office. St. Paul's call was a direct and miraculous one. The apostle Paul writing to Timothy, exhorts him "not to neglect the gift which was in him, which was given him by prophecy, and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," (1 Tim. 4 : 14,) and, himself thus a called and ordained minister, he bids him ordain others to the same office, saying, "and the things that thou hast heard of me

among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2 : 2). And the same exhortation he addresses, also, to Titus, saying, "for this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee." (Tit. 1 : 5). The apostle, also, bids Timothy "lay hands suddenly on no man," *i. e.* not in too much haste to ordain any one to the work of the ministry, lest one not rightly or truly called would thus be inducted by him into the sacred office, who would do much harm, and Timothy himself would thus become partaker of his sins. (Tim. 5 : 22). Paul and Barnabas, also, in their missionary journey, not only confirmed the souls of the disciples, and exhorted them to continue in the faith, but they also, we read, "ordained them elders in every church," (Acts 14 : 23,) *i. e.* set apart by ordination certain chosen and qualified men as pastors of the churches. And, as the highest possible proof of the point under consideration, let us never forget that even our Saviour, although divine and possessed of an anointing for His official work from all eternity, yet did not enter upon it, or assume the public discharge of its functions, until He was first, by Baptism and the descent upon Him of the Holy Spirit, solemnly and visibly set apart to it and inaugurated into His messianic or ministerial office. (Matt. 3 : 13-17).

The Scriptures, however, teach this truth of the necessity of a call to the ministry by many specific precepts and inferences also. The Saviour, *e. g.*, in many of His parables, where the servants (ministers) are represented as being employed, directed, and rewarded by God as the Great Householder and the Lord of the Vineyard, thus teaches it. (See *Dr. Diehl's Essay, Lutheran Diet*, vol. 1, p. 266). The same is implied, also, in His exhortation to His followers to pray that men may be raised up, qualified and sent forth to labor in the Church as ministers: "Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth laborers into His harvest." (Matt. 9 : 38). Above all the Saviour's commission to the Apostles, and to the ministry of all ages, teaches it.

“All power,” He declares, “is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” (Matt. 28 : 18–20). And the same is also repeatedly declared in the writings of the Apostles “God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?” (1 Cor. 12 : 28–30). “God hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.” (2 Cor. 5 : 18). “Let a man so account of us as the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God.” (1 Cor. 4 : 11). And James (3 : 1) exhorts: “My brethren, be not many masters or teachers, (*διδάσκαλοι*), knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation;” *i. e.* let not many aspire to be religious teachers or guides to the Church, for not many are qualified or called to be, and only those who are qualified and called should be. Or, as Luther renders it: “Lieben brüder, unterwinde sich nicht yedermann Lehrer zu sein; und wisset das wir desto mehr Urtheil empfangen werden.”

Beyond all possibility, then, in view of the passages which have now been cited, of honest doubt or refutation, it stands proven from the word of God that there is such a thing as a “*Call to the Ministry*,” and that as this Article of our Confession teaches, “no man should publicly in the church, teach or administer the sacraments except he be rightly called,” *i. e.* really has this right or regular call. Or, as St. Paul expresses it: “No man taketh” (*i. e.*, ought to take) “this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron,” (Heb. 5 : 4).

HARMONY OF THE ARTICLE WITH THE VIEWS OF LUTHER AND OF THE GREAT LUTHERAN DOGMATICIANS.

The views of Luther and of the great Lutheran dogmaticians are, of course, all in entire accord with the teachings of

this Article of our Confession which we are now considering. With one voice all assert the necessity of a "*rite vocatus*" before assuming the discharge of ministerial acts or duties. Luther, it is true, was charged by the Romanists with virtually, by his teachings, abrogating the ministerial office, and with breaking down all distinction between the ministry and the laity. But no charge ever preferred against the great Reformer was more utterly false and groundless.

Luther held that all Christians, in baptism, become priests, and are endowed with all the spiritual rights and duties of priests. But he made a distinction, for the sake of order, and in simple justice on the part of one toward others, between the *possession* of priestly rights and duties and the *exercise* of those rights and duties. The exercise of these priestly functions, he held, was a limited one by virtue of the fact that every Christian is a member of a communion, the Church. If every one, according to his own pleasure, where and whenever it may please him, should assume to perform his priestly duties, he would, by so doing, interfere with the rights of his fellow Christians, and would thereby bring about an injurious or destructive confusion in the Church. All individual Christians cannot, in the same manner, and at the same time, exercise the functions of their Christian priesthood toward others. This is simply impossible. And under ordinary or normal circumstances, where there is a church, it is also entirely unnecessary. The church or congregation, as an organic unit or whole, Luther held, is bound to preach the word of God, but she can, of course, do this only through individual persons whom she has thereto authorized and commissioned. These individual persons whom she thus authorizes and commissions, speak in her name and in her stead. She, the Church, speaks by the mouth of these individual persons who are her instruments. She, however, is really the person speaking.

Thus is there, according to this view, in the Church, and grounded in her very being, a *church-office*, viz. the office of the ministry. She cannot live without it. Where the Church is, there is, also, this office, and there also will its

functions be exercised. And each Christian in the exercise of the functions of the ministerial office, by those appointed by the Church thereto, sees the fulfilment of the command which makes the preaching of the gospel the duty of the entire Christian communion, as also his own individual duty. And thus, also, in the very nature of things, are there limits set to each Christian in the exercise of his priestly rights and duties beyond which, as one in a body where all have equal rights and duties, he neither need nor dare justly go.

Luther's words, in thus teaching that the ministerial office grounds itself in an obligation resting upon the Church as a whole, have been interpreted as if he rested the existence of the ministerial office wholly upon a voluntary contract, entered into between a certain number of Christians who, by mutual consent, conferred upon *one* of their number that which was the duty of *each* of them. This has been declared too slender a foundation upon which to rest the office, imperiling the very existence of the same. But, in supposing this to have been Luther's view, of the office of the ministry, injustice is perhaps done him. Luther did, indeed, teach that in the official discharge of the duties of the ministry by those elected or ordained to the office, every Christian could and should see a discharge of his own duties, as one of the universal priesthood, and that he should recognize himself as having conferred upon the one officiating the exercise of his duty as far as it is a public or congregational duty. But in thus teaching, Luther by no means held that in this lay the *root* or *origin* of the office, as though it were created by or sprung merely from some such contract made by men. On the contrary, he clearly recognized the root of the office as one planted by God Himself. He knew that as the Church is before the individual Christian, so also is the office of the ministry, or all official action, before the action of the individual. He repeatedly asserts that the Church cannot be without the office; and it is not left to the option of individual Christians, be their number ever so great, whether or not there shall be an office. By their agreement they do not create the office, but they simply fill the office, already existing, with a

man of their choice. They simply make an office-bearer. The consecration by the bishop, Luther wrote to the German nobility, is nothing else than as if he, instead of and in the name of the whole assembly, took one of the number, all having inherently equal power or rights, and set him apart to exercise this power or right for the rest. Or, it is as if ten brothers, princes, equal heirs, should choose one of their number to administer the inheritance for them. The royal or princely right is there, and belongs to all; the administration of the same is, however, conferred upon one. The same is true of the office of the ministry and the election or appointment of men to fill the same. The office exists. It exists in the Church, in which, as equal spiritual priests, all Christians have equal priestly rights and duties, and some of whom the Church thus, out of her own number, chooses and sets apart to discharge for the rest the public priestly functions devolving inherently upon each and all. Hence, since the office is a permanent one in the Church, there remains no occasion for each individual Christian to exercise his priesthood in public teaching; nay, simply because there is such an office, and that office is filled by men whom the Church has specially appointed to the office, it becomes the duty of all not thus appointed to be silent and not assume thus to teach. From the very beginning of his work, Luther insisted upon it that only those thus called to the office of the ministry should discharge the duties of that office. He distinguished sharply between the right and the exercise of the right. All Christians, he taught, are priests, but all are not pastors. (*Vide Plitt's Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, pp. 370-72). "Either show," he indignantly writes to those assuming to teach without a call, "either show your call and command to preach, or keep silence and presume not to preach. For here an office is in question, yea an office of preaching. But an office no one can have without a command and call." (*Erlangen Ed.*, 31, 218). Again: "There must be bishops, pastors, or teachers, who publicly and specially administer the four things mentioned above, on account and in the name of the Church, but by the appointment of

Christ, as St. Paul says, Eph. 4 : 11. For the multitude cannot do this, but must commit it, or have it committed, to an individual. What would the consequence otherwise be, if each would speak and officiate, and none would give way to the other? It must be committed to one alone, and he alone must be permitted to preach. The rest must all hold their peace and consent to it." (*Erlangen Edition* 25, 364). And very emphatically does he repel the slanders of his enemies upon this point, in writing to Emser in 1521: "Thou sayest falsely that I make bishops, priests and pastors of all laymen, and teach that they may officiate without a call; and, holy as thou art, concealest the fact that I also write that no one should presume to administer the office without being called except in extreme necessity." (*Erlangen Edition* 27, 255. See, also, 39, 215-216).

No one, therefore, held more clearly and tenaciously to the necessity of a call to the ministry, before assuming the duties of the ministry, than Luther. If necessary, passage upon passage could be quoted in proof. (*Vide Dr. Walther's "Kirche und Amt,"* pp. 174-187, also, *Prof. M. Loy, "The Ministry,"* pp. 74-106).

Equally clear and emphatic in their utterances upon this point are all the leading dogmaticians of our Church since Luther's day. With unbroken unanimity they insist upon what our Article calls the "*rite vocatus*."

Thus CHEMNITZ declares :

"All Christians are indeed priests (1 Pet. 2., Rev. 1), because they offer spiritual sacrifices to God. Each one also at his own home both can and should teach the word of God, (Deut. 6 : 7, 1 Cor. 14). Nevertheless it is not every Christian who should take upon himself the public ministry of the word and sacraments. For not all are apostles, not all are teachers, (1 Cor. 12 : 29) but those only who by a special and legitimate call from God, (*sed qui peculiari et legitima vocatione a Deo ad hoc ministerium segregati sunt*) are set apart to this ministry." (*Exam. Conc. Trid. II. de s. ord. c. 1*).

And again :

"It is certain from the word of God that in the Church no

one ought to be heard who has not been lawfully called. For Paul distinctly says, (Rom. 10 : 15) that they cannot preach, *i. e.* by right, even though they may actually attempt it, who have not been sent. And in (Jer. 23 : 21) God complains : ‘I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran.’ Indeed the churches ought not and cannot with any profit, hear those who have not testimonies of a lawful call.” (*De Ecclesia*. 3, 119).

GERHARD says :

“We must distinguish between the *general* command and vocation, (*distinguendum enim inter generale mandatum et vocationem*) which all the pious receive when they are made Christians, * * * and the *special* vocation or call, (*et inter specialem vocationem*) by which the administration of the word and sacraments, in the public assembly of the Church, is, by the Church’s public consent, entrusted to certain suitable persons, which vocation is not common to all Christians, as appears from 1 Cor. 12 : 29 ; Eph. 4 : 11 ; James 3 : 7.” (*Loci Theologici, De Ministerio Ecclesiastico*, Sec. 67).

QUENSTEDT says :

“When, in the Church properly established through the word, the regular or appointed ministers of the Church rightly discharge the duties of their office, it is permitted no one to enter the office of teaching without a legitimate call, but it is in every way necessary that each one be legitimately called and chosen, even a special calling is necessary in order to enter (rightly) the office of the ministry, so that, without it, it is permitted no one to teach publicly in the Church, and to administer the sacraments. Augs. Conf. Art. XIV., etc. (*Vide Quenstedt’s Theologia Didactico Polemica, Pars Quarta, Caput xii., Sectio ii. p. 397*).

CARPZOV says :

“Access to the office of public instruction is granted to no one unless he has in due form been first called.”

HUNNIUS says :

“No one who desires to be a minister of God ought to push himself into the office, but ought to be properly ordained for this purpose.” (*Epitome Crelendorum, Eng. trans., p. 240*).

HOLLAZIUS, in answer to the question, "*Quid est Ministerium Ecclesiasticum?*" says:

"Ministerium Ecclesiasticum est officium sacrum et publicum divinitus institutum, et certis atque idoneis hominibus per legitimam vocationem commendatum, ut peculiari potestate instructi verbum Dei doceant, Sacramenta administrent, et disciplinam Ecclesiasticam conservent ad gloriam Dei, hominum que salutem promovendam." (*Vide Hollaz., Examen, de Min. Eccl. Pars iv., Cap. 2, p. 859*).

Thus, with one consent, do our great Lutheran theologians enforce this doctrine of the necessity of a call to the ministry, and thus do all repeat and emphasize the truth taught in our Article, viz., "that no man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the Sacraments, except he be rightly called, or without a regular call."

And yet this discharge of ministerial duties is not, always and absolutely, to be limited only to those who, by a right call, have been placed in the ministerial office. The rule has its exception. Under certain special circumstances any Christian, even though he be not a minister, may and should exercise at least some of the functions of the ministry. From Luther down through the entire line of our Lutheran dogmaticians, it has by all been freely admitted and taught that, *in all cases of absolute necessity*, any Christian layman, and even any Christian woman, may preach the word, administer baptism, and pronounce absolution. This exception, like the rule itself, although, of course, for a very different reason, springs from the spiritual priesthood of each Christian. In the former case, or in the observance of the rule, as expressed in Article XIV. of our Confession, there is on the part of each individual Christian a *withholding* of the exercise of his priestly rights, out of regard to the equal priestly rights of his fellow Christians; and in the latter case, *i. e.* when in case of necessity, although not in the office of the ministry, he performs ministerial duties, he simply *resumes* the exercise of his rights, and he discharges those duties on the strength of his commission as one of the universal priesthood of believers.

And hence the *Appendix to the Smalcald Articles* says: "In case of necessity, a mere layman may absolve another, and become his pastor; as St. Augustine relates that two Christians were in a ship together, the one baptized the other, and afterward was absolved by him." (*Book of Concord, Eng. trans.*, p. 568).

LUTHER says :

"If a number of pious laymen were taken prisoners, and placed in a wilderness, without a priest consecrated by a bishop, and these agreed among themselves to elect one of their number, whether married or not, and commit to him the office of baptizing, administering the Eucharist, absolving and preaching, he would undoubtedly be a priest, as much so as if all bishops and popes had ordained him. Hence it is that, in case of necessity, every one can baptize and absolve, which would not be possible, if we were not all priests." (*Luther's Works, Erlangen Edition*, 21, 282).

GERHARD, L. T., (*De Min. Ecc.*, § 74):

"In a case of extreme necessity, when a man must either depart without baptism, or baptism must be administered by a private person, it is better that baptism be administered by a private person, than that the man should depart without baptism; nevertheless the administration of baptism ordinarily belongs to the ministers of the Church."

HOLLAZIUS, (*Examen Theologicum De Min. Ecc.*, q. viii., obs. 2):

"In the collecting and establishing of a Church, where there are not those present who, having been ordinarily called, may teach, nor any at hand to give a call, in this extreme case of necessity, where the glory of God and the salvation of our neighbors are alone to be regarded, we willingly grant that any Christian is bound to instil the catechetical milk of righteousness to those unskilled in speech."

Ib., (*De Baptismo*, q. iv.):

"Extraordinarily and in case of necessity, any pious Christian, whether male or female, acquainted with sacred rites, can administer baptism."

Ib., (*De Eucharista*, q. iv.):

“Not even in case of necessity, is the administration of the Holy Supper to be committed to a layman or private Christian; because there is a distinction in this respect between Baptism, which is a sacrament of initiation, and the Eucharist, which is a sacrament of confirmation. Concerning the necessity of Baptism Christ bears witness, (John 3: 5). But the use of the Holy Supper has not been made of equal necessity; and therefore when there can be no recourse to the ordinary ministry, then the remark of Augustine is in place: ‘Believe and thou hast eaten.’ ”

Thus in case of necessity, as Luther and all our theologians admit, may those *not* in the ministerial office, or those not having what our Article designates the “*rite vocatus*,” perform ministerial acts. But let it be clearly observed that, where this is allowed, there must be a real and absolute necessity. In all other cases it is irregular and wrong for a layman to usurp the functions of the ministry. Where a minister is present, or where the presence and services of a minister could in any way be secured, there it is the minister alone who can rightly preach the word or administer the sacraments, and for a layman, there and under such circumstances, to attempt these duties is unwarranted presumption. Our great Luther in all that he wrote upon the priestly rights and duties of laymen, was nevertheless always most careful to guard jealously the distinctive prerogatives of the ministerial office, and he always strenuously asserted that there must be an actual and extreme *necessity* in order to justify a layman in publicly teaching in the Church or administering the sacraments. This belonged, not to the spiritual priesthood, but to the pastoral office. And only by those *in* the office, save in case of extreme necessity, shall these duties be discharged. “In einer Gemeinde,” he writes, “da Jedem das recht frei ist, soll sich deselbigen niemand annehmen ohne der ganzen Gemeinde Willen und Erwählung; *aber in der Noth brauche sich deselbigen wer da will.*” (W. x. 1858). Again: “Niemand soll selbst sich des unberufen unterwinden *es wäre denn die äusserste Noth.*” (Walch, xviii., 1597). And

again, upon the supposition that the Christian is where there is no Church and no ordained ministry, and where all around him are perishing in sin, he writes: "In solchem Falle sieht ein Christ aus brüderlicher Liebe die *Noth* der armen verdorbenen Seelen an, und wartet nicht ob ihm Befehle oder Brief von Fürsten oder Bischöfen gegeben werde, *den Noth bricht alle Gesetze und hat kein Gesetz.*" (Walch, x. 1801-3).

Laymen being thus justified, in Luther's judgment, in the exercise of the functions of the office of the ministry, only in case of the most strenuous necessity, our whole modern system of lay evangelism or lay preaching finds no countenance whatever in his teachings; and, were he now living, above that of all others would his voice, in thunder tones, be raised against it, condemning it as unscriptural in principle and unprofitable and injurious in practice. Would it not be well, merely for the sake of consistency if for no other and higher reason, if those bearing the Lutheran name and boasting at times so loudly of their Lutheran relationship, were also to know more of Luther's sound and conservative views upon this whole subject and adhere more to his wise and judicious example with regard to it.

THE CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS OR FACTORS OF THE "RITE VOCATUS" AS REQUIRED BY THIS ARTICLE.

But what, let us now ask, is this "call to the ministry," or this "*rite vocatus*," which is thus demanded by our Article? What are its constituent elements? In what does it essentially consist?

1. *This right call to the ministerial office consists, first of all, in the possession of the needed ministerial gifts and qualifications.*

We may assume, as an *a priori* truth, that God *calls* no one into the office of the ministry whom He has not beforehand *qualified* for that office. Having revealed in His word what gifts and qualifications a true bishop or pastor must possess, He would, in the very nature of the case, call those only who possess the gifts and qualifications thus required. Besides, the ministry being pre-eminently a peculiar and special work,

in its very nature unlike all other vocations, and hence requiring special and peculiar gifts and endowments, fitting a man for it, and necessary in order to render him happy and successful in it, we must take it for granted that God, by the Holy Spirit, calls no one to this special work without also conferring upon him the gifts and qualifications necessary for it. The very fact, therefore, that an individual is possessed of the special gifts and characteristics, designated in the Sacred Scriptures as qualifications for the ministerial office, is at once, in itself, an indication that possibly God wills him to enter that office. The conferring of the gifts is, in part at least, the "call." It is a divine revelation of the divine will concerning him; an intimation to him from heaven of what his life mission should be; a true voice of God calling to him, out of the very depths of his being, saying: "This is the way which I have marked out for thee—walk thou in it." Thus, indeed, God, in part at least, indicates to *every* man his providential mission in life. The purpose of God with regard to every human being is that he should glorify Him and enjoy Him forever. And hence, in the natural or constitutional endowments already of each one, and in the providential orderings and spiritual experiences of his life afterward, God fits one human being thus to serve and glorify Him in one position or sphere of life, and another in a different position or sphere. And this providential designation of a man to a particular class of duties, or to some special employment or mode of life, is, on this very account, even in popular language, spoken of as his "calling." What a man is clearly and evidently *fitted* for, that, also, men say, he is *called* to; and what he has no qualification or endowment for, that, they say, he is not called to. And so emphatic is our intuitive recognition of this truth that God designates men to their work in life, by the very talents He confers upon them or withholds from them, that when a man succeeds in what ever he undertakes, men instinctively say: "he has found his calling;" or, if he fails, they say: "he has mistaken his calling." In either case there is the clear recognition of this invisible, yet most positive, thing designated the man's "call-

ing ;" i. e. the will of God framing the man's being and fitting him for some certain and especial sphere or mission in life, and the man either reading that will, and falling in obediently with it, and, by doing so, making life a success, or not reading it, and perpetually going counter to it, and, in consequence, making a failure of life.

Especially, or in the highest and fullest possible sense, is all this true with regard to a man's calling of God into the office of the ministry. By the gifts God confers upon him, by the fitness for the work which in any way He bestows upon him, God calls him to the work, and makes it his duty to assume and discharge it. In that striking and beautiful simile which the apostle uses in his epistle to the Romans, he likens the Church to the complex human body, in which the members not only differ from one another, while each is essential to the whole, but the office and functions of each, also, are determined by their individual fitness for their respective offices and functions. "Having then," is his language, "*gifts* differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith ; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering ; or he that teacheth, on teaching ; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation." (Rom. 12 : 6-7). And, in his letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 12 : 4) he expressly refers these personal gifts to the Holy Ghost as their author, and declares their express object or design to be to qualify those who are so gifted for their personal and respective duties. "Now, there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man, to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit, the word of wisdom ; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit ; to another faith by the same Spirit ; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit ; to another, the working of miracles ; to another, prophecy ; to another discerning of spirits ; to another, divers kinds of tongues ; to another, the interpretation of

tongues; but all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will."

As regards the office of the ministry, therefore, and as regards indeed all other offices and duties in the Church, these two points, from the word of God, are clear—viz. that the endowments or qualifications which men may possess for these respective offices, are the gifts to them of God, and that they express, both to their possessor and to others in the Church around him, that the will of God is that he upon whom He has thus bestowed such gifts should exercise them also in the especial office or duty for which he is thus especially fitted. Or, in other words, the divine endowment of a man for the ministerial office, constitutes essentially the divine "call," also, to that office; and the will of God that a man should be in the office is expressed by the peculiar fitness which He gives him for it.

What these especial gifts and endowments, thus qualifying a man for the office of the ministry, and thus making it his duty to enter it and labor for God's glory in it, are, the word of God, as also the experience of the Church, clearly reveal. They divide themselves into three classes, viz. suitable natural endowments both of body and of mind, suitable training and education or discipline and development of these natural endowments, and then, as the crown of all, suitable spiritual qualifications, or the possession, in an eminent degree, of the fruit and unction of the Holy Spirit, sanctifying and consecrating both the natural endowments and the educational acquirements to the single and supreme object of glorifying God. The first, therefore, is the bestowal of God in creation, the second in providence, and the third in grace; each His gift, and each necessary to fit a man for the office. The "call" implies and includes them all.

There must, first, be the necessary natural endowments both of body and of mind. There must be proper *bodily* qualification. It is extremely doubtful whether God calls a man with a defective or unhealthy body into the office of the ministry. Under the Old Testament no man who was maimed or blemished in any of

his bodily members was allowed to enter the priest's office. "Speak unto Aaron saying, Whosoever he be of thy seed in their generation that hath any blemish, let him not approach to offer the bread of his God. For whatsoever man he be that hath a blemish, he shall not approach: a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose, or anything superfluous, or a man that is broken-footed, or broken-handed, or crooked-backed, or a dwarf, or that hath a blemish in his eye, or be scurvy or scabbed; no man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the Priest shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the Lord made by fire; he hath a blemish; he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God." (Lev. 21 : 17-21). Of course I do not here forget that this requirement of bodily perfection existed in the office of the *priesthood*, and under the *Old Dispensation*, which was largely typical, and that the office concerning whose "call" we are speaking, is the office of the ministry under the *New* or Gospel Dispensation. And yet I also remember that in each of these Old Testament requirements we have an expression, not simply of the divine will concerning the special thing to which the requirement applies, but an expression also of that will concerning the general subject or object with which that special requirement stands related or connected. The thing specific under the Old Dispensation was the order of the priesthood, and the thing specific under the New Dispensation is the office of the ministry, but in both the thing general is public divine worship, and who shall be the official ministers or functionaries of that worship. A physical disqualification under the one dispensation, therefore, would, it seems to me, be equally a disqualification under the other dispensation.

But, apart from what the word of God may thus teach upon this subject, the duties and demands of the ministerial office are such that the successful and uninterrupted prosecution of it imperatively requires *bodily* soundness and vigor of a high order. Men, in feeble health, and of frail physical constitution, like Baxter and Doddridge and Summerfield, have, of course, been eminently useful in the work of the

ministry. And yet, with health and bodily strength, how much more useful they would have been. How much work for Christ and souls, because of their limited strength, was necessarily left undone. How much, for the same reason, was feebly and unsatisfactorily done. And in how many such cases of feeble health, when the Church perhaps expended her means in educating the man for the ministry, and when he has perhaps barely entered upon it, he soon becomes utterly incapacitated, is compelled to relinquish his work, and speedily sinks into the grave. A sound, vigorous, healthful body is, then, an essentially important natural endowment which all who seek the office and work of the ministry should possess.

The same is true, even in a higher degree, of the *mental* endowments and capacities of those seeking this sacred office. These should always be of an high order. The ministry is a work which requires, in the nature of the case, a strong, vigorous mind. It demands a high order of native intellect. He is not called to the ministry whose capacity of thought, whose original endowments of reason and understanding, are not above the capacities and endowments with which men generally are by nature gifted. The minister is to be the student and interpreter to the people of God's word, he is to be the leader of religious thought, he is to originate and mould public sentiment, he is to be the teacher and instructor of society, he is to be the head and governor of the church of which the Holy Ghost shall make him the overseer. Can such a position be properly filled by a man of ordinary mental power? Does not the full and successful discharge of such high duties demand also the possession of a high order of talent? Men of comparatively feeble natural ability have, I am aware, in spite of their feebleness, in some instances, been extensively useful; but even these, it must be admitted, often owe their usefulness more to certain favorable surroundings and helps than to their own personal endeavors. Besides, their usefulness is generally limited to certain peculiar localities, and to a certain class of minds and range of society of their own level, or even below their own level,

but ceases, or is greatly diminished, when they are transferred to other and more cultured and thoughtful communities. And yet the Saviour bids His ministry to make the *world* their field, and hence requires that they should be fitted also to labor with success in any part of it.

The "call" to the office of the ministry includes, then, suitable natural endowments, both of body and of mind. Completeness and health of body ; vigor and strength of mind ; quickness and grasp in apprehension ; soundness of judgment ; stability in purpose ; attractiveness in person ; affability in address and manner ; readiness and force in utterance ; born leadership in the character of his whole being, both of body and mind ; these are some of the gifts which God, in his very creation already, bestows upon the man whom He calls into the office of the ministry.

But, beside these *natural* endowments, which are the gifts of God by creation, there are, also, conferred upon all whom He calls into the ministerial office, *the additional endowment, secondly, of suitable education and training, or the discipline and development, by culture, of the mental capacities bestowed by creation.* Natural gifts alone are insufficient to meet fully, especially in this our day and land, the demands which are made upon the ministry. There must also be the additional endowment of culture, the development, the training, the discipline of the mental faculties into their highest possible measure or capacity of usefulness. Scholarship as well as talent, education as well as genius, attainments as well as endowments, are required by all who would be workmen in the office of the ministry, not needing to be ashamed, able rightly to divide the word of God. This has always been so. Moses, although naturally possessed of the highest order of genius, was nevertheless "learned, also, in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." (Acts 7 : 22). The Apostles were during three years under the personal tuition of the Saviour Himself before they were sent forth upon their ministerial work. Paul, the most useful of the Twelve, was also the best educated of the Twelve. "A well educated ministry of religion, has always been the ordinance of heaven,

from the earliest records of history to the present hour. The educational provisions of the tribe of Levi, the schools of the prophets, the scribes and doctors of the law among the Jews, the personal training which Christ gave His apostles, the celebrated schools of the early Church, and the Universities and Colleges of later and present ages, all of which were expressly founded and designed for the suitable education of ministers, and often in the face of almost incredible difficulties, bear a most remarkable and unbroken testimony to the settled judgment of the Church, on this point, in all its dispensations." (*Considerations on a Call to the Ministry*, by the Rev. Dr. M. B. Hope, Prof. in the College of New Jersey). There have of course been some uneducated men, who have yet been useful men. But such men are exceptions to the rule. God can, we admit, make an illiterate and uneducated man successful in the preaching of the word. With Him all things are possible. Even a dumb ass, if He wills it, can be so made to speak that a prophet himself, sitting upon it is instructed by it. But that does not prove that He wants only dumb asses to be His ministers. He may sometimes, for special reasons, depart from His general order or rule, and He may sometimes make ignorance serve His purpose, but if He does, He does it in spite of the ignorance, and by other factors beside and above the ignorance. God never uses ignorance itself as an element of ministerial success. God calls no man into the ministry *because* he is uneducated and ignorant. If such a man does find his way into the ministry, and chances to be useful, he is so despite his lack of education and despite his ignorance; and he would, under the same circumstances, if he were not ignorant, be vastly more useful. In all the past ages of the Church, the men who have risen to the highest measures of usefulness, who have impressed themselves upon their generations for good, whose influence survived them and moulded the thought and life of generations following, were educated men. And, if in any age in the world's history, God called only cultured and intelligent men into the office of the ministry, He does

so now, in our age. Ours is an age of more than ordinary intelligence among the masses, an age of intense mental activity, an age of inquiry and investigation, an age of skeptical assault upon the very foundations of Christianity, an age in which unsanctified genius and scholarship are massed in deadly hostility against every essential doctrine of our most holy faith. At such a time especially, therefore, is a talented and learned ministry an absolute necessity. Now, when liberty all over our land is tending to licentiousness, and when infidelity and every possible system of false religion, are stalking abroad and are impudently challenging the credentials and faith of the believer, it would surely be more than folly, it would be a crime to entrust the defence and propagation of the faith to any other class of men than men of clear, strong, well-trained, and well-furnished minds. Now, more than ever, the Church demands a ministry which will "hold fast the faithful word, and be able, by sound doctrine both to exhort and convince the gainsayers; for there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." (Tit. 1:9-11). Now, more than ever, God calls only men possessed of thorough mental training into the office and work of the ministry. The "*rite vocatus*" never did include, and does not now include, the factor of ignorance.

And hence, also, our *Formula of Government and Discipline* very properly requires of all candidates for the ministry that their "examination shall embrace *at least* the following subjects, viz.: "Personal Piety, and the motives of the applicant for seeking the holy office; the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures; the Evidences of Christianity; Natural and Revealed Theology; Church History; Pastoral Theology; The Rules of Sermonizing; and Church Government." This is as it should be. So much, at least, should in every case, be required. It is, however, greatly to be regretted that this requirement of our "*Formula*," moderate as it is, is not always in our Synods enforced. In some of our Synods it is most flagrantly disregarded. Men from the ministry of other

churches in which theological and scientific training for the ministry is not pretended, are slipped into the ranks of our ministry as easily and quickly as though we pretended to such training as little as the churches from which such applicants come. And men, from the membership of our own Church, with scarcely an education sufficient to secure them an appointment as teachers in the common schools of our land, are yet, by the solemn "laying on of the hands of the presbytery," received into the ministerial office, and sent forth as the accredited teachers of the Church of Christ. Like the conies, such men, send them where you will, are "a feeble folk." They are not called of God to the ministry. They cannot, in the nature of the case, wield an influence such as the ministry should command for good. They are objects of indifference to the masses, and of contempt to the thoughtful and intelligent, wherever they go. They degrade, in public estimation, the ministerial office; they weaken the influence of Christianity, whose representatives and defenders they assume to be; and they prove an injury and not a blessing to the Church whose interests they have thus entrusted to them. By no possible stretch of charity can we believe that such men have the "*rite vocatus*," or the true call from God to enter the office of the ministry, and should never, therefore, be admitted into it. And hence, in order to correct this evil, our General Synod owes it to the Church, as a simple matter of self-protection, and owes it to the cause of Christ as a simple matter of justice and of right, to insist upon the enforcement, to the very letter, of the requirements, in this respect, of her own "*Formula*," and by the establishment of the same high standard of qualifications for admission in all her District Synods, and the establishment of better inter-synodical agreement and comity, so that whatever will exclude a man from admission into the ministry in one of our Synods will equally do so in every other, make it absolutely impossible for men, illiterate and unqualified, to receive licensure or ordination at her hands.

There is, however, another kind of training for the ministry beside this culture of the mind or training in the schools,

which is a very important qualification, and very necessary in order to a man's greatest possible influence. I refer to the culture of personal habits; the training which will give to a man the ease and bearing of a thoroughly refined Christian gentleman. The minister is capable, if fitted for it, to wield an immense *social* influence and power. He can, by his taste and accomplishments, by his ease and grace in society, by his attractive air and manner, by the winning and pleasing social qualities which he possesses, make himself a desirable and ever welcome guest in every home in the community, can draw all with whom he thus comes in contact to himself, can especially win the young as his admirers and friends, and can thus gain a power for good which will be almost boundless. For, after all, as ministers we reach men, if we reach them at all, by this very thing of what we are to them personally and in the plane of our social relations to them. By this they are either repelled or attracted. By this they are either prepared or unprepared to be benefitted by our public ministrations to them. And yet how many ministers there are whose training for their position is, in this respect, lamentably defective. It is a very delicate subject upon which to speak, and yet it may as well be spoken, but are there not men in the ministry of every Church, possessed of fine natural ability, of able scholarship, and of undoubted piety, who nevertheless, simply because of their lack of social culture, their uncouthness, their boorishness, their coarseness, their lack of ease and grace in good society, their destitution of the refinement and taste, the self-possession and unaffected affability and suavity which always characterize a man as a gentleman, cut themselves off from the influence for good which they would otherwise command, and fail to reach and win for Christ many whom otherwise they would reach and win? Looking at such men, the question has often forced itself upon my mind, Is there not something defective in our system of training for the ministry which neglects a factor of ministerial usefulness so important? Do we not in our Ministeriums, when men present themselves before us for induction into the sacred office, inquire too

little into their fitness for the work, by this characteristic of their social qualifications? Are such men, after all, really called of God into the ministry? Does He want them there? Have they, indeed—ought they to have—the “*rite vocatus?*” Moses was not only a man of great learning, but he was a man, also, of courtly and refined manners. Paul constantly reveals himself to have been a thorough and elegant gentleman. Our Saviour must have been very easy and winning in His social intercourse and relations, else the common people would not, as they did, have heard Him gladly; else the multitude would not have gathered so eagerly and intimately around Him on every possible occasion; else He would not have been invited to dine, as He often was, in the house of proud Pharisees; else He would never have been the frequent and most welcome visitor in the house of Martha and Mary and Lazarus that He was. “Be courteous,” is a scriptural injunction addressed to all Christians. Is it not especially addressed to ministers? Can we be as useful as the office of the ministry demands that we should be, without it? Does God call a man into the ministry who is thus socially unqualified for the ministry? These questions might, with profit, be pondered by many.

Among the gifts, however, necessary above all others for the work, and without which God calls no one to the office of the ministry, is the gift of eminent personal piety.

The validity of ministerial acts, it is true, does not depend upon the personal or subjective moral character of him who performs the acts. The sacraments, *e. g.*, have in themselves an inherent or objective efficacy. The word of God is still the word of God even though proclaimed by one who has never experienced its power in his own heart. “Although,” says our Augsburg Confession, (Art. VIII.) “the Christian Church is properly nothing else than the congregation of all believers and saints, yet, as in this life there are many hypocrites and false Christians, open sinners remaining even among the pious, the sacraments, nevertheless, are effectual, even if the preachers by whom they are administered be not pious, as Christ Himself says, (Matt. 23 : 2) “the Scribes and Phar-

isees sit in Moses' seat." And the *Apology*, (*De Ecclesia*, Art. VII. et VIII.) says: "Nor are the sacraments without efficacy because administered by unworthy and ungodly men; for they stand before us by virtue of the call of the Church, not on their own authority, but as representatives of Christ, who says, (Luke 10 : 16): "He that heareth you heareth Me. Thus Judas was also sent to preach. Now, although ungodly men preach and administer the sacraments, they officiate in Christ's stead. And this declaration of Christ teaches us that, in such cases, the unworthiness of the servant should not offend us."

And yet, whilst all that the Confessions thus teach is true, and whilst an ungodly man's ministerial acts may, notwithstanding his personal unworthiness, result in some measure of good because of what the word and sacraments are in themselves, nevertheless it is also true that God never *calls* ungodly men into the office of the ministry, nor, if they thrust themselves uncalled into it, does He ever crown their labors with great or extensive spiritual results. God calls no one into the ministry whom he has not first called to be a Christian. Have whatever else he may, if he has not eminent personal piety, he has not the right call to the ministry. "God qualifies men for the office," says Dr. Wayland, "by making them disciples of Christ, His renewed and obedient children, heirs of everlasting life. We can never suppose that God would employ men who are His enemies, in rebellion against Him, to persuade others to be reconciled to Him; that is, to do what they steadfastly refuse to do themselves. Unless a man have within himself the evidence that he has been born again, he has no right to enter the ministry. And, on the other hand, unless a man give evidence, by a Christian life, that he is in heart a true disciple of Christ, no body of believers can without sin call him to the ministry." (*Wayland, The Ministry of the Gospel*, pp. 27-28). "The first evidence," says another writer, "of a call to this high and holy office is genuine piety. An elevated tone of piety, experimental and practical, consistent and controlling, active and glowing, is an essential requisite, absolutely indispensable

to the faithful discharge of its appropriate duties. All the directions of inspiration enjoin or presuppose a pious heart, renewed by the Holy Ghost, baptized with the spirit of Jesus Christ, and brought completely under the sanctifying influences of Divine truth. To the minister of the Gospel are entrusted most momentous and solemn interests. He is commissioned to make known to men

“The eternal counsels, in his Master’s name
To treat with them of everlasting things,
Of life, death, bliss and woe.”

It is preposterous to expect a man to communicate, expound, enforce and apply the truths of the Bible, who has never felt their power in his own heart, who neither understands, believes nor loves them. How shall he testify of the sufficiency of the remedy proposed in the Gospel unless he feel his own spiritual malady? How shall he awaken the careless sinner, if he himself is lulled into security? How shall he feed the flock of Christ, purchased with His precious blood, who has no interest in that purchase? How can he relieve the tempted, sympathize with the children of sorrow, bind up the broken-hearted, and comfort them that mourn, who has no experimental knowledge and no spiritual experience? How shall he who has never realized, and, therefore, never felt, the pressure of his own sins, present the word “fitly spoken” to distressed and heavy laden souls? How can he give to every one his portion in due season? How can he guide anxious and doubting souls? How can he show to the weary traveler the road which he himself has never traveled? The men, then, who fill the ministerial office, must be men of eminent piety; men of burning and untiring zeal; men whose hearts glow with the love of Christ; men full of faith and of the Holy Ghost; men who will not hesitate to do anything or suffer anything for Christ; men who will forsake even the comforts of refined society, and the endearments of home, and with their lives in their hands, go forth to the destitute settlements in our own country, or to the distant heathen, to preach the glad tidings of redemption to perishing sinners.

The ministry adapted to the present state of the Church and of the world, must be characterized by a broken spirit before God, compassion for the souls of others, and an unction from the Holy Ghost. The piety needed must be so consistent and controlling, as to constantly influence the feelings and passions, the desires and volitions, the daily habits and enterprises of the individual. It must be so elevated and deep toned as to pervade the soul, sweeten the temper, and lead daily to the faithful examination of the heart and to the entire consecration of the life to God." (EV. REVIEW, Vol. xii., pp. 199-200).

But, to sum up, and to show you in the clearest and fullest light, what the character and piety are of a man fitted for the ministerial office, and truly called of God into it, let me yet quote the words of an old author who was himself the highest human realization of a true Gospel minister that the world and the Church have ever seen. He writes as follows: "This is a true saying, if a man desire the office of a bishop (*ἐπισκοπος*) he desireth a good work. A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous, not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." (1 Tim. 3 : 1-7). And let me also yet, in order to show you the godly spirit in which this grandest of human preachers prosecuted the work of the ministry, read you a quotation from a farewell discourse which he delivered when he resigned the pastorate of the Church at Ephesus. "Ye know," is his language, "from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears and temptations which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews: and how I kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have showed you and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews

and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." (Acts 20 : 18-27).

Such now, in their three-fold character of natural endowment, of acquired culture, and of bestowed Christian character and grace, are the gifts which, according to God's word, and as taught by the experience of the Church, must be possessed, and always are possessed, by those who are called of God to the office of the Gospel Ministry. The "*rite vocatus*" of our Article includes them all, and he who has not these "*gifts*" from God has not the "*call*" from God.

It should hardly be necessary to add, and yet it is, that the *subjects or persons* whom God thus, by the bestowal of this fitness for its duties, calls to the office of the ministry are always *men* and *not women*. In His word He emphatically forbids women to speak or preach in the churches of the saints. "Let your women keep silence in the churches," is His clear and unmistakable command, "for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And, if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the Church." (1 Cor. 14 : 34-35). And again: "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection; but I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man; but to be in silence; for Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." (1 Tim. 2 : 11-14). Thus does God in His word, plainly and positively forbid women to preach. Would He then now "*call*" them to what He has thus forbidden them to do? Besides, is not woman, in the very constitution of her physical being, and especially in the formation of her vocal organs and capacities, unfitted for the work of preaching the word? Are not, also, the very instincts of her being, the innate modesty, the retiring diffidence of the nature with which God has en-

dowed her, and which constitute both her charm and her power, all of which she must first do violence to before she can bring herself into willingness to assume a work so public and conspicuous, an abiding protest against it? Is it not all as Horace Bushnell well styles it, "a reform against nature?" Is it not all in direct conflict with the divine purposes concerning woman as revealed in the Scriptures? "I will therefore," says God in His word, "that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." (1 Tim. 5:14). Just as some Christian *men*, because disqualified and incapable rightly to discharge its duties, are not called of God to the office of the ministry, so, for the same reason, together with the additional reason that God wills woman to glorify Him, in the specific domain of home, no woman is called to the office of the ministry. (*Luther's Works, Erlangen Ed., Vol. 28, p. 50*).

2. *The "rite vocatus," or the right call to the ministerial office, consists in a clear and heartfelt conviction, wrought by the Holy Ghost in the individual's own consciousness, that it is the will of God that he should enter that office and labor in it for the divine glory.*

I purposely here make use of the word "*conviction*," meaning by it the voice of conscience, and an inner and imperative sense of duty. A mere *preference* of the office and work of the ministry to any other vocation or calling in life; a mere *consent*, under the persuasion of friends, or because of the force of favorable circumstances, to enter it; a strong *desire* even, considered in itself alone, to fill that sacred position; all these are not sufficient evidences in themselves of a divine call. All these may exist, and the man still not be rightly called. The right inner call is something very different. It is more than mere willingness, or preference, or desire, or strong inner impulse. It springs purely from the domain of conscience. It comes with the force and dignity of an ethical imperative; a supreme moral obligation; an overwhelming and ineradicable sense of duty; all that, in its deepest and fullest sense, is expressed by the word *ought*. Many falsely regard themselves as possessing the divine call simply

because they *feel* moved to become ministers, without, for a moment, inquiring into the origin or moral character of their feelings. The mere fact that they have, no matter to them how it has been awakened, a *desire* to preach, is to them proof abundant that they are also *called of God* to do so. This desire, they assume, could have been awakened in them by the Holy Ghost only; and can be nothing less than the voice of the Holy Ghost saying to them that they are chosen of God to the work. As was noticed in the early part of our lecture this was the notion concerning the call to the ministry which was held by the Anabaptists, and by other fanatics, in the days of the Reformation. It was the theory also of the entire School of Mystics. It is the theory which is now held by the Friends or Quakers. And it is the theory, also, upon which, in all our different Protestant Churches, we too much proceed in determining the question whether or not a man is divinely called to the ministerial office. "Do you *feel* yourself called to preach the Gospel," is by many made the chief or decisive question; and, if the candidate declares that he does thus feel, the matter is already largely settled. The candidates, own subjective impressions concerning himself are regarded as a kind of holy of holies into which it would be irreverent or possibly criminal for any, with doubts and questionings, to enter. And many a young man decides to study for the ministry, and education societies decide to support him, and Theological Seminaries decide to receive him, and Synods decide to license or ordain him, and churches decide to elect him, not primarily, as they all should, because he possesses such scripturally defined ministerial gifts and graces as indicate the will of God in the case, but largely, if not sometimes altogether, simply because he declares that he feels himself inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to enter the ministry.

It is scarcely necessary to say that all this is very wrong. This exaltation of a mere subjective impression, or a mere desire, into an unquestionable and infallible oracle or expression of the divine will, has put many a man into the office

of the ministry whom God did not call there, and whose induction into it resulted unhappily to himself and injuriously to the Church.

The mere desire to become a minister, is, in itself, no proof of a divine call. That desire may be born of ignorance, or of vanity, or of ambition, or of indolence and love of ease, or of mere morbid excitement, or of regard to the wishes of others. It may spring from a thousand unsanctified and selfish sources. There may not be a single divine influence or factor of grace in it. In proof of this, how frequently is it not the case, and especially in times of religious awakenings, that young men feel inwardly moved or "called" to seek the office of the ministry who most clearly have no fitness whatever for it, and who in a comparatively brief time, not only lose the desire which they had for the ministry, but lose often their very profession of piety and again go back into the world and into sin. How many, also, are there not to-day, in the office who, by their inefficiency and perpetual lack of success, show, beyond a doubt, no matter how strong may have been their feeling or desire for it, that that feeling or desire was not wrought in them by the Holy Ghost, and that they ran without having been divinely called or sent. On the other hand, also, how often is it not the case that those who are evidently most fitted for the ministry, and who are most clearly called of God into it, have yet but little or no desire to enter it, and who, if they do enter it, do so at a sacrifice of their own personal predilections or preferences, and only from a deep-seated and solemn sense of obligation or duty. They are men in whose eyes the ministry is an office of the highest possible sanctity and responsibility, and for the right discharge of whose duties they feel themselves both utterly unworthy and incapable. And hence, as the will of God is more and more clearly revealed to them, and the conviction grows upon them that they are indeed divinely called to be ambassadors for Christ, there is within them an instinctive moral shrinking back from it, a pleading with God to be exempted from the assumption of such mighty responsibilities, and an asking tremblingly: "Lord, who am I that

Thou shouldst send me?" Thus Moses, and Jonah, and Jeremiah, were all without an "inner call" to their work, in the sense of a burning and irrepressible desire for it, and each of them assumed it only because God made it clear to their understanding and conscience that it was their duty to assume it. Neither of them *wanted* to be a minister of God. If left to their own personal preference and choice not one of them would have been what they were-called of God to be. "Oh, my Lord," was the plea of Moses, "I am not eloquent neither heretofore nor since Thou hast spoken to Thy servant, but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue." (Exodus 4 : 10). "Ah, Lord God," cried Jeremiah, when the Lord came to him, calling him to his prophetic work, "behold I cannot speak, for I am a child." (Jer. 1 : 6). And, when "the word of the Lord came to Jonah, the son of Amittai, saying : Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city and cry against it, for their wickedness is come up before me," Jonah, instead of desiring the work thus divinely assigned him, "rose up to flee to Tarshish from the presence of the Lord, and went down to Joppa ; and he found a ship going to Tarshish : so he paid the fare thereof, and went down into it, to go with them unto Tarshish, from the presence of the Lord." (Jonah 1 : 1-3). Or, as Bishop Simpson, in his Yale Lectures, correctly says : "There is not an instance in the Holy Writ where a true man was ever anxious to bear the divine message. He always shrank from it, hesitated, and trembled."

The existence, therefore, of a desire for the office of the ministry, even in a strong degree, is, in itself, no conclusive proof of a divine call. Such desire may exist where God has not spoken. Satan himself may, indeed, be its author ; even as St. Paul teaches, when he says : "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works." (2 Cor. 11 : 13-15). And how, it might here pertinently be

asked, *could* Satan use a man to greater advantage in hindering and injuring the Church and cause of Christ than simply by calling him, if bad, or even only weak and unqualified, into the responsible office of the ministry? How intensified, when once in the ministry, his influence for harm and evil!

This inner call of God, the subjective impression made by the Holy Ghost, the "*rite vocatus*" from above, and not from beneath, is not, then, a mere sentiment or emotion, no mere desire or impulse, no mere preference or persuasion, but it is a calm, rational conviction of duty. It grounds itself in the personal conscience. It is begotten by the Spirit of God in the sacred retreat of the individual consciousness. It is the deep-seated sense of the soul that it is the will of God that it should seek to enter the office. It is wholly what *God* wills in the matter, and not what the man *himself* wills. It is, in a word, the conviction, rising up in his consciousness into certainty, that God has qualified, or will qualify, him for the work of preaching the Gospel, and calls him to it; and that, no matter what *his* choice of a life-work might have been, *God's* choice for him is the ministry, and that only at the very peril of his soul's salvation can he decline to do what God thus bids him do. At first, indeed, this conviction may be very faint. He comes probably into this consciousness of what is his duty gradually. As he contemplates the perishing condition of the world, as he prays from day to day "thy kingdom come," as he reads more and understands better the word of God, as he learns better what are the scriptural qualifications necessary for the ministry, as he studies and knows himself more and finds that God has conferred these needed gifts even upon him, as he has suggested to him by others the thought that possibly God desires him in the ministry, as he grows in strength of Christian character and in willingness in any and every way possible to glorify God, and especially as he submits himself more and more to be guided and used by God in whatever service He may choose for him, and prays to have in all things no will but God's will, as he does all this, the conviction that he is called of God to the office of the ministry dawns upon him, grows on him, expands

gradually into greater clearness and positiveness, settles down, at last, upon his conscience as a sure call from God, and causes him, in the spirit of loving obedience and of filial subjection, to say as said Isaiah the prophet, "Here am I, send me," (Isaiah 6 : 8), or as said Paul, the apostle, "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." (1 Cor. 9 : 16).

And thus is there in every true call to the ministry, not as constituting in itself the call, but simply as a precursor or concomitant of it, and moral means of preparation for it, this conviction in the subject himself that he is called of God to the work. This it is that moves him humbly to present himself to the Church, whose is the power of the keys, for her judgment in his case, and to receive at her hands the outward or true call. And hence in the Episcopal Church, in the ordination of deacons, the bishop demands of the candidate, "*Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministry, to serve God for the promotion of His glory and the edifying of His people?*" And the candidate must answer, "*I trust so.*" In the ordination service of our own Church, the candidate is asked, "*Do you believe that in seeking the ministerial office, you are influenced by a sincere love to God your Saviour, and desire to promote His glory.*" (*Formula*, chap. xix., sec. 2, 4).

In harmony, also, with all this are the views of our great Lutheran dogmaticians. For, whilst they are always most emphatic in their condemnation of an "inner call," in the fanatical and unscriptural sense in which it was held by the Anabaptists, Schwenkfeldians, Weigelians, Quakers, and others, denying the need of any outward call by the word and the Church, and making this subjective impulse in itself the supreme and the only necessary call, they nevertheless admit and clearly teach that there is such a thing as an inner inspiration or divinely wrought impression, in the consciousness of those whom God has gifted or qualified for the ministerial office, moving them to seek entrance into it, and causing them to feel that by laboring faithfully in it they will be able to do most for His glory.

GERHARD, *e. g.*, (*De Min. Ecc.*, sec. 75) says:

"We grant that God, by an inner impulse and inspiration, breathes into some this disposition to undertake the ministry of the Church, without regard to dangers or difficulties; to which belongs, also, that mysterious impulse by which some are drawn to the study of theology. We also grant that it is absolutely required of the minister that he be not allured either by ambition, or avarice, or any other wicked desire, but that induced by the pure love of God, and the desire of edifying the Church, he should accept the ecclesiastical office offered him; and if any one desire to apply, in a proper sense, the name of secret call to these dispositions, both of which are especially worthy of praise, we do not greatly object. Yet, in the meantime, we give the warning, that, in order that the doors be not opened to the disturbances of the Anabaptists, or the revelations of the enthusiasts, no one, by reason of this secret call, ought to take upon himself the duties of the ministerial office, unless there be added to it the outward and solemn call of the Church."

CHEMNITZ (iii., p. 119) on 1 Tim. 3 : 1, says:

"To desire the office of a bishop is not without a lawful call to take upon yourself ministerial functions; but he who understands the foundations of heavenly doctrine, and is to a certain extent endowed with the gift of teaching, in offering his labor to God and the Church, by this very act, seeks for nothing else than that God, by a lawful call, may declare whether, when, and where He wishes to use his ministry in the Church. And such a one ought to be endowed with such a mind, that, if a lawful call would not follow this petition, he would not take it upon himself, but would say with David (2 Sam. 2 : 26), 'But, if He thus say I have no delight in thee, behold, here am I, let Him do to me as seemeth good unto Him.'"

In the "*rite vocatus*," or the regular call to the ministerial office, as demanded by this Fourteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, there is, then, a subjective impression, or inner conviction, wrought by the Holy Ghost in the conscience of the individual, moving him to seek the office, and

anointing him, as it were, beforehand with spiritual fitness for it, but which nevertheless is not in itself the call, and is not his true and final divine commission to preach the word and to administer the sacraments, or to assume and discharge the duties of the ministerial office. That true divine call is given, not thus directly and immediately, but indirectly and mediately through the Church to which Christ has delegated this power. Hence:

3. *The "rite vocatus," or the right call to the ministerial office, in its essential and highest form of expression, consists in the official recognition by the Church, in her exercise of the power of the keys, of the possession on the part of the person seeking the office, of those special gifts and graces required in the word of God as qualifications for the office of the ministry, and the public and solemn induction of him, by the rite of ordination, because of his possession of such special gifts and graces, into the ministerial office.*

In Article VII. of our Confession, the Church is defined to be "the congregation of all believers, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel." (See, also, *Apology* VII.)

To the Church, thus defined, belongs the right of calling into the ministerial office. This right to "call" is hers, because to her has been committed by the Saviour the "Power of the Keys," (*Potestas Clavium*). "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. 16 : 19). "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John 20 : 23).

What this "power of the keys" is, we find admirably explained in our Confessions. The Augsburg Confession, (Art. XXVIII., *Of the Power of the Bishops or Clergy*), says: "Accordingly they teach that the power of the keys or of the bishops, according to the Gospel, is a power and commission from God to preach the Gospel, to remit and to retain sins, and

to attend to and administer the sacraments. For Christ sent forth the Apostles with the command: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." This power of the keys, or of the bishops, is to be exercised and carried into effect alone by the doctrine and the preaching of the word of God, and by the administration of the sacraments, to many or to a few persons, according to the call. For by this means are conferred, not temporal, but eternal blessings and treasures; as eternal righteousness, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. These blessings cannot be obtained otherwise than by the office of the ministry, and by the administration of the holy sacraments."

The *Apology*, also, (XIV., *Of the Power of the Church*) says:

"But we are speaking of true Christian bishops; and we are pleased with the old division, namely: that the power of the bishops consists in *potestate Ordinis* and *potestate Jurisdictionis*, i. e. in the administration of the sacraments, and in spiritual jurisdiction."

Now, this "power of the keys," the Saviour, as Head of the Church, has given not, as the Romish doctrine upon this point claims, to the popes nor to the bishops, as a separate and superior order, but to the *Church*, as the whole congregation or body of Christian believers. As is also declared in the *Appendix to the Smalcald Articles*: "To this point the declarations of Christ pertain, which show that the keys are given to the whole Church, and not simply to some particular persons; as the text says, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' (Matt. 18 : 20). And as Gerhard also, (*De Min. Ecc.*, 87), writes: "Cuicumque claves regni cœlorum ab ipso Christo sunt traditæ, penes eum est jus vocandi ecclesiæ ministros. Atqui toti ecclesiæ traditæ sunt a Christo claves regni cœlorum. Ergo penes totam ecclesiam est jus vocandi ministros."

In what *sense*, however, precisely the Saviour has thus given the keys to the whole Church, whether immediately or mediately, whether He has given them to her as a pure democ-

racy, having in herself, in her collective capacity and directly, the authority to exercise their power, or whether He has done so only mediately, through the ministry which as His ambassadors He has placed in the Church, to act as part of her and for her, and yet in His name as King and Head to be spiritually over her, all this has long been a subject of dispute. Some, as is well known, take the position, and we think correctly, that "the church or congregation has the keys, not *immediately*, but *mediately*, in the word of God and in the holy office of the ministry." Thus Grabau, and many others bearing the Lutheran name, and devoted to the Lutheran polity and doctrine in their most conservative and churchly aspect, earnestly maintain. "If it now be said," writes Grabau, (quoted by Dr. C. A. Hay in EV. REVIEW, vol. xxi., p. 617) that this special ecclesiastical authority is given by Christ to His *Church* upon earth, nothing more is intended than that it was instituted in the Gospel and set up *in* the Church by ordinary means through the efficacy of the Gospel in the form of the *office of bishop or preacher*." And again: "In this house of God now there are the keys of Christ through means of the Gospel *and the office of the ministry*, not because they have their origin there, but because that is the appropriate spiritual theatre where they can exhibit their power for the consolation and salvation of souls, and be thus *put to use*. And in *this* sense the Smalcald Articles say that the keys are given to the whole Church."

But, admitting that the power of the keys, whether mediately or immediately, has been given by Christ to the *Church*, three questions may now be pertinently asked, each of which, if correctly answered, will help us into a clearer and better apprehension of our subject, viz.:

When, or in what act, does the Church lawfully exercise this her *jus vocandi*, or right of calling?

Through whom does she lawfully and properly perform this act?

And what is the precise import or character of the act which she thus performs?

First: When, or in what act, does the Church lawfully exercise this her jus vocandi, or right of calling?

Does she do it in the election of a man as its pastor by a single congregation before his ordination, or does she do it in the act of his ordination before his election? Does the election precede the ordination, or does the ordination properly precede the election? Is he elected because he has been ordained, or is he first ordained in order that he may subsequently be properly elected? In a word, does the act of the separate congregation in choosing him to be its pastor, place him in the ministerial office, or does the ordination by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery or Ministerium place him there? Is the voice of the Church, in other words, heard in the voice of the congregation, or in the voice of the Synod or Ministerium representing many congregations and expressing the more general opinion or judgment of the Church in the matter?

It is well known that Luther held to the view that election, and not ordination, constituted the true outward or mediate call of the Church into the office of the ministry. He taught that whenever and wherever a congregation of believers, whether their number be large or small, are associated together in the use of the word and sacraments, and choose or elect one to preach to them that word and administer to them the sacraments, the one thus elected is by that act of election made a minister, or truly and really placed in the ministerial office, and is thus as truly in the office as though he had been ordained by the hands of bishops. The *election* is the "call," and the ordination is merely the subsequent declaration or recognition of the fact that there has been such a "call." (*Vide Luther's Letter to the Senate and People of Prague, in 1523*).

The Appendix to the Smalcald Articles also expresses this view. "The common usages of the Church," it declares, "likewise prove this: for in former times the people elected clergymen and bishops; then the bishops living in or near the same place, came and confirmed those elected by the laying on of hands; and at that time ordination was nothing

else than this approbation." (*Book of Concord, Eng., trans.*, p. 401. Also *Dr. Walther's "Kirche und Ampt,"* pp. 248-255).

But, however much we all revere the name of Luther, and incline to yield our judgment to his, this view which he thus held that in the congregation itself was divinely vested the *jus vocandi*, and that an election of a man as its pastor by a congregation, constituted a *rite vocatus* and placed such an one legitimately in the office of the ministry, does not at all commend itself to us. It is, we modestly dare to assert, in its entire conception, essentially wrong, and, if practically carried out, would necessarily lead to disastrous results.

It assumes, first of all, that an individual congregation, though it consists of but two or three persons, is the Church. On the contrary, the Church is "the congregation of *all* believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel." (*Augs. Con.*, Art. VII.) "The Church," says Schmid, "is the *Kingdom* in which Christ exercises His dominion; and hence many dogmaticians append the doctrine concerning the Church to that concerning Christ as the sovereign in His empire." (*Doctrinal Theology*, p. 602). "The inner and essential form of the Church," says HOLLAZIUS, "consists in the spiritual union of true believers and saints who, as members of the Church, are bound together with Christ the Head, through true and living faith, which is followed by a communion of mutual love." The individual congregation, therefore, having the pure word and sacraments, is part of the true Church, and there the Church truly is, but it is not in itself thus alone the Church. A part is never the whole, and should never be regarded as the whole.

Again: this view is based upon extravagant notions of the rights and powers in the case of an individual congregation. Being but part of the whole, it cannot rightfully do anything which affects the whole, without the consent and co-operation of the whole. "The individual congregation," says Prof. Worley, "while it has for itself all the rights and immunities of the Church, is not the Church and has no authority to act for other congregations or for the Church in

general. Congregations sustain to the Church universal about the same relations which individual members do to the congregation. No individual Christian in the exercise of his scriptural rights in the congregation can act for others, or by his own will can determine and act for the congregation; yet he enjoys for himself all the rights and privileges which pertain to the congregation. And so while a congregation may enjoy and claim for itself, and even under particular circumstances perform for itself, all which appertains to the Church at large, no congregation can dictate or legislate or perform any function pertaining to the Church at large, for other congregations or for the whole Church. All those offices of a general nature, which have regard to promoting and securing the welfare and upbuilding of the whole Church, are of this nature, and can only be properly performed by the Church in her representative capacity, an essential and the only steadfast element of which is the holy ministry." (EV. REVIEW, vol. xv., pp. 317-318).

Again: This theory that the right to call is vested in the individual congregation, and that the election of a man to be pastor of such congregation, is the true call of the Church and puts him into the ministerial office, assumes that the Church, in the true order of events, precedes the ministry, and creates or calls the ministry into existence only as she herself has need of a ministry. But it seems to us clear, beyond room for doubt, that precisely the reverse of all this is true. Instead of the Church preceding the ministry, the ministry precedes the Church, and by the preaching of the word creates and perpetuates the Church. Instead of the office being thus the result of mere human convenience for the orderly and profitable enjoyment of the word and sacraments in and by the Church, it is a separate and divinely established institution, whose field is the world, and whose commission authorizes those filling it to go anywhere as the accredited ambassadors of Christ. And instead of each separate congregation thus exercising the power of the keys and entrusting men with the holy office of the ministry, the Church at large, composed of many congregations, acting in

a representative capacity, alone, except in case of necessity, should do it. To the Church in her official and organic oneness is the power given to call men into the ministry, and this calling does not create the office but merely fills it. Christ Himself is its author, and it is He who, through the Church, acting in her organic capacity in His stead, says to all who rightly enter the sacred office: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world, Amen." (Matt. 28 : 19-20).

But again: The theory under consideration has, we are satisfied, if rightly considered, the weight and authority of the apostles and the early Church, also against it. We know full well that in those early days of Christianity, in many cases no doubt, the election by the congregation preceded in the order of time the act of ordination by the apostles and by others; and under the circumstances no other order could then well have existed. The Church then was in its merely formative state. The great truths and facts of Christianity, as taught by the Saviour during His ministry, and as they occurred and were made known during the Week of Passion and on the day of Pentecost, were carried by the thousands who had come up to Judea and Jerusalem, and afterward by others whom the persecution which arose scattered abroad, into all parts of the world. And, as the result, men and women were won to the truth which they thus heard; converts were rapidly made; churches everywhere sprang quickly into existence; the persons in these churches best qualified were naturally chosen to serve as pastors; and afterward when these churches were visited by the apostles, these men whom the churches had thus chosen as their pastors were the ones, of course, whom at the request of the churches, the apostles ordained. It was altogether the best, and indeed the only order which then could be pursued. But whilst all this is true, does not the very fact that they, under such circumstances, ordained at all, clearly show that the

election by the church was not, in their judgment, a true induction into the office of the ministry, and that the voice of the churches which had thus chosen them was by no means final in the case, but was submitted for final decision to the apostles and to the ministry whom they had ordained, as the highest official representatives of the whole Church? If upon examination, the apostles had discovered that one thus presented to them for ordination was unqualified for the work of the ministry to which he had been chosen by the congregation, they, of course, would have refused to ordain him, and in consequence he would not have been in the ministerial office, even if the Church, defiant of apostolic authority, would still have retained him as their religious teacher or pastor. So that the election, going before ordination, was the result of the peculiar condition in which the Church then, in its incipient or inchoate state, was, and was not designed therefore to be the order of filling the office of the ministry in after times or now. Even then already, no doubt, ordination, in some cases, was administered where there had been no election to become the pastor of some special Church, but where the person or persons ordained were by ordination simply placed in the office and commissioned to go wherever the Providence and Spirit of God might lead them, preaching the word. Thus Paul and Barnabas were set apart, by the laying on of the hands of the other teachers or ministers at Antioch, for the special missionary work upon which they then departed. (Acts 13 : 2-4). There is no proof that Timothy, when, "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," he was ordained, was ordained as the pastor of some special church, but simply that by ordination he was brought into the ministerial office, and thus fitted to receive election as pastor. The same is true, also, of Titus. There is no absolute or certain proof that he was ordained to the exclusive and special work in the island of Crete. Paul merely says : "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." (Tit. 1 : 5). And this command which Paul thus gives him,

as he also gave Timothy, (2 Tim. 2 : 2) to "ordain elders in every city," does not necessarily require that we believe or suppose that these elders or ministers thus ordained had all previously been elected by the people as their pastors. They may have been. There is simply no proof that they were.

And hence, in view of all this, whilst in no case recorded in the New Testament, was a pastor ever placed over a congregation without the full consent and desire of its members, yet this desire and consent, we are satisfied, even if expressed in a formal choice or election, in no instance was regarded as the call into the ministry, but this call was always regarded as being given in ordination. The laying on of the hands of the apostles or presbytery was the act by which the Church, in the name of her ascended Lord and Head, gave the *rite vocatus*.

There are still other objections to this theory of thus making the election the call, and of thus reducing ordination to a mere empty ceremony.

It begs the question with regard to ordination, declaring it to be an unnecessary and useless form merely of approving by the Church at large what the individual congregation has done, which is, indeed, the very point at issue or in dispute.

It is in direct conflict also with the conception of *unity* as an attribute of the true Church of Christ and, by thus giving to each congregation the right to exercise the power of the keys and to admit men to the office of the ministry, it makes the Church no longer "one Holy Catholic Church," but a mere multiple of separate and independent churches.

Again: it places the power of deciding upon the qualifications of candidates for the ministry in the hands of those, in the nature of the case, least able wisely and well to decide upon them; for who will claim that there is in the churches that measure of scriptural intelligence and discriminating knowledge of the ability and fitness demanded in the ministry, which would make it safe or right to submit to popular vote the question of who shall and who shall not constitute

the ministry ? (EV. REVIEW, vol. xi., p. 323). Practically carried out, and literally executed, it is a theory which would, we feel sure, so degrade and lower the standard of ministerial qualification and efficiency, and so involve the Church in peril from within herself, as to render her utterly weak and defenceless against her foes, and imperil her very being.

And so evident is this, that even those who hold to this view that with the congregation rests the right to call, and who strenuously insist upon it as the correct theory concerning the ministerial call, nevertheless do not absolutely and rigidly adhere to it in practice. Among our Missouri Lutheran brethren, *e. g.*, for whom I am sure I cherish the profoundest Christian regard, when a congregation becomes vacant, instead of acting for itself in strict independence, and instead of electing, without consultation or regard for synodical authority, either one of its own number or another from abroad, as its pastor, as a rule, first of all, it applies to the President of the Synod who, in his official position, expresses for the time being the judgment of the Church general in so far as it is represented in the Synod, and whomsoever he names and commends to them as possessing suitable ministerial gifts and as worthy of their confidence and suffrage, the congregation elects ; the very thing in substance which is done among us when in Ministerium we ordain a man and and thus commend him to the churches, and when subsequently a church, having confidence in the recommendation thus given, chooses him to be its pastor. In both cases the judgment of the ministry, and not that of the congregation itself, determines the choice.

But, yet another very serious objection to the theory we are combating lies in the view of the ministerial office itself which it necessitates and assumes. As it appears to us it virtually abolishes the office. Accepting the view that the source of the objective or outward call is the individual or local church, instead of the Church catholic as the Body of Christ, and assuming that it does consist in the temporary transfer, for the mere sake of order and propriety in public

worship, of the priestly functions and rights possessed by all the members as part of the universal priesthood, to the one whom they thus choose to be their pastor, there can be no such thing as a separate, divinely-instituted, and divinely-perpetuated ministerial office, and what is called the ministerial office is merely a nice and convenient human arrangement. Under such an order of things there is no office of the ministry at all. Then a man, if a pastor, is a minister, and if not a pastor he is not a minister. Then he is in the ministry to-day, and out of it to-morrow. Then the ministry exists only while performing ministerial acts. Then ordination, if proper and necessary once, is equally proper and necessary, and should be repeated at each change of pastoral field. Then men who have been ordained as pastors, and afterwards became missionaries in heathen lands, or professors in our colleges and seminaries, or editors of our ecclesiastical journals, are no longer in the ministerial office, but sustain to the Church the mere relation of laymen. Surely this is no proper conception of the office. Men whom God has called to the office are not thus called into it or dropped out of it by the mere existence or non existence of actual pastoral relations. On the contrary, the office exists by divine institution in the Church. The call, based upon suitable qualifications, uttered by the Holy Ghost in the conscience of the subject, and recognized and solemnly declared by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery as the organ of the Church in her corporate or official capacity, places the man in the office; and in that office he *abides*, remains a minister and not a layman—whether a pastor or not—until by death, or by the same authority by which he was instrumentally placed in it he is removed from it. And hence the election of a man to be the pastor of a church, instead of thereby making him a minister, or putting him into the ministerial office, is simply, if done rightly, the expression on the part of that church of their belief that he is, by virtue of his ordination, a true minister, and that as such they choose him to be their pastor. His ordination was his call; and now their election of him as pastor is a providential indication to

him of the special field where God wishes him to exercise his ministerial gifts.*

Luther's views are, of course, as we have already said, directly opposed to the position which we have thus taken. And yet in our interpretation of his views, both justice to him and to the truth requires that we should well consider the special character of the conflict which Luther was then waging, and the necessity which was then laid upon him, in the prosecution of his reformatory work, to emphasize sharply, and to defend jealously, individual and congregational Christian rights over against the hierarchical despotism of Rome, which denied to the people the privilege of choosing spiritual shepherds, and withheld from them the preached word and sacraments in their completeness and purity. In the emergency and necessity thus laid upon him, and as the best possible weapon which he could use against the crushing tyranny which the Papacy was then exercising over the Church,

*"The word of God and our Book," says Dr. Hodge, "teach that the right to rule, to preach, to administer the sacraments, and to ordain, belongs to every minister by virtue of his office. If a man is ordained a presbyter, he has, by authority of Scripture, all these rights; and he cannot be deprived of the one any more than of the others. He has indeed no right to exercise his authority either to preach or to rule in a particular congregation without their consent; but their election no more makes him a ruler than it makes him a preacher.

* * * To say that a man cannot be a presbyter except in virtue of his connection with a particular Church, is as much as to say a man cannot be a physician without a prescribed number of patients, or a captain if not in actual command of a ship, or a general unless when at the head of a brigade. Owen consistently carries out this doctrine, and maintains that as no man can be a bishop or presbyter but in relation to a particular congregation, no Church has a right to ordain a man to preach to the heathen, (Works, vol. xx., p. 457). When a theory comes to such an issue, it may fairly be assumed to have broken its neck. In the Apostolic Church all ministers ruled. They met together with the apostles and brethren to decide important questions; they formed churches and ordained elders; and yet not one in ten of those ministers was a pastor, or sustained any special or permanent relation to any particular Church. Presbyterians do not believe that Timothy was the pastor of Ephesus, or Titus the bishop of Crete." (*Church Polity*, pp. 267--268).

he revived the long forgotten doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, exhibited and defended it with all the force and vigor of his strong and enthusiastic nature, and made a practical application of it as a remedy for then existing evils, which possibly the exigency of the times demanded, and in doing which he undoubtedly acted with the utmost sincerity, but which, nevertheless, in the normal and established condition of Protestantism, now and since Luther fought and won his great battle, is not needed and cannot safely be practiced. As Dr. Plitt, (*Einleitung in die Augustana*, vol. 2, pp. 374-376) correctly says: "He so strongly emphasized that the official action was identical with the individual action of every Christian in order to oppose the haughty spirit of the Romish officials, who were exalting themselves above all others, declaring their action to be sacramental, and trying to rule over the whole Church." And again: "In order to cut off all possible false inferences and conclusions, we must not forget that Luther was brought to this sharp emphasizing of the rights of the individual congregation, *by the then existing times*. It was a time of great distress in the Church. The official representatives of the Church were not willing to fill the office in the individual congregations with preachers of the pure truth. They abused their right of calling a person into the office to the damage of the Church, while there were in the congregation believing members of the Church, or evangelical Christians. This was the condition of things which demanded peculiar advice and extraordinary measures. And in view of this Luther wrote: 'As a Christian congregation must not and cannot be without the word of God, it is evident that they must also have teachers or preachers proclaiming that word.' (*Walch*, 22, 146). Every individual Christian has the right, and it is his duty, *should necessity urgently demand it*, to act as teacher. How much more, then, is it right that a whole congregation call one to this office, *if need be*, as is at all times, and especially now, the case. It is the duty of the individual congregation to fill the office, regardless of others, *in case of necessity*. Luther always adds this, and in calling for such

(congregational) action, he never forgets to emphasize that the congregation concerned should examine itself whether it stands firm in the faith, and thus have a good conscience with regard to the action which it thus performs. Being assured of this, it can cheerfully act as in the name of God."

The one essential thing, then, in Luther's estimation, was the preaching of the pure word of God and the right administration of the sacraments. This constituted the Church. To this the Church was entitled. And hence, *in case of necessity*, and where those having the power of appointing or ordaining ministers for the Church; abuse their power, and seek to place over the churches pastors who will withhold the pure word and sacraments from them, there, under such circumstances, and as a final and only remedy for such evils, each congregation, upon the strength of the spiritual priesthood to which every baptized member belongs, shall choose or elect for itself a pastor, and such election, even without ordination, shall be and is a true call of the one thus chosen to the office of the ministry. And evidently all that Luther aimed at, in all that he says with regard to the right of a congregation to call into the office of the ministry, was to preserve the churches from having unworthy and false teachers imposed upon them against their consent. They had, he claimed, the essential right to say who should, and who should not, be their pastors. And the question primarily was not so much whether election was the call, as whether there existed the right with the people to elect; and only in order to vindicate this congregational right to elect was he led, upon the ground of the universal priesthood of believers, to take the position that, in case of necessity, such election, even without ordination, was a valid and true call. "We do not say," is the language of the Wittenberg theologians, "that the Romish method of calling pastors is in every particular wrong, in that the bishops ordain ministers; but we cannot approve their course in placing pastors over churches without the knowledge or consent of the people, because, according to the old saying, 'The calling of a pastor, without

the consent of the people, is null and void.' ” (Quoted by Dr. Diehl, *Luth. Diet*, 1877, p. 305).

That Luther did not, in thus seeking to defend his position over against the tyrannical claims of Rome, often press too far his doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, and of the office of the ministry as the result merely of the delegated or deputed rights of the many to the few who, for the sake of order in worship, were to conduct the public services and act as pastors, we are not willing to maintain. On the contrary, we believe that he did, and that the office of the ministry, as we have already said, has an infinitely higher origin, is *divine* in its source, and exists as a distinct and divinely perpetuated ordinance in the Church. The doctrine of a spiritual priesthood is undoubtedly a precious truth, and in electing a man as their pastor, the members of a church do, as Luther taught, delegate to him the exercise in public worship of their priestly functions, but in doing so they do not put him into the office of the ministry, but simply into a pastoral care over themselves; for the Church, not as a mere fragment or part, but in her organic and representative whole, has the power of the keys. “The office of teaching and administration is the glory of the Church’s organization, and while it takes away from the spiritual priesthood none of its special glory, neither does it borrow its light and authority therefrom. There is a spiritual priesthood; but distinct from it, yea, going before it, is the office of reconciliation, for whose perpetuation the Head of the Church has made special preparation and instituted a certain order.” (EV. REVIEW, vol. xi., p. 339). And even Luther himself, in his later writings, reveals, if not a decided change, at least a great modification of his earlier views upon this whole subject of the relation between the Christian priesthood of believers and the office of the ministry. Instead of regarding the office of the ministry as the product merely of the delegated rights and functions of fellow Christians as equal priests, he evidently conceived it, more and more distinctly, as an ordinance of God, and as an office in the Church and for the Church, but still not essentially of the Church. It is

true, he nowhere in a formal manner retracts his earlier views, and expressly declares that his opinions have changed, but, as has been clearly shown by those who have specially examined his writings in this respect, it is yet simply a fact that Luther, in his later years, assumed substantially a different position in regard to the relation of the universal priesthood to the ministerial office, from the position which he so tenaciously maintained in his earlier years. He more and more came to relinquish his theory of delegation of priestly rights and duties, by the many to the one, as the source and establishment of the office, and conceived it more and more as a distinct and purely *divine* office, founded by Christ, and filled by the Apostles and their successors, in regular and unbroken ministerial succession. (See "*Luther on the Office of the Ministry*," translated from the German of Dr. A. W. Dieckhoff, by Rev. Prof. Martin, EV. REVIEW, vol. xxi., p. 182).

Thus receding, with his advancing years, from his earlier views with regard to the relation between the universal priesthood of believers and the office of the ministry, Luther, we may now add, must also, logically and necessarily, have receded from the position that the call to the ministry is rightly given through or by the individual congregation, and is limited in the exercise of its functions to the congregation, but must, more and more clearly, have gradually come to see that such a call can lawfully be given only in ordination, by the laying on of the hands of the Ministerium as the official and authoritative organ and expression of the Church universal as the Body of Christ.

The answer then, in view of all that has been said, to the question, "*When, or in what distinct act, does the Church lawfully exercise her jus vocandi, or right of calling?*" at which we arrive is this: The Church thus exercises lawfully her right of calling, or, by virtue of the power of the keys which she possesses, gives the true call to the office of the ministry, not in the act of election by an individual congregation, but in the solemn act of *ordination* by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, or of those who *represent* and *act for* the Church

in her catholic unity and entirety as the corporate and unbroken Body of which Christ is the universal and ever living divine head. Ordination gives the call, and the call which is thus given is the only true outward call into the ministerial office which the Church either does or can give. Election, on the other hand, when rightly and properly effected, is simply the choice, on the part of a congregation, of one who by ordination is already in the office, as its pastor, in order that he may in that relation exercise the functions of the office with which he had by ordination been entrusted. Ordination, therefore, except in cases of extremity or necessity, in the order of time, comes first, and election comes after. Ordination gives the office; election gives the opportunity for the proper and lawful exercise of the office. Ordination makes a man a minister of the gospel; election recognizes him as such, and invites him to his official work because he is a minister.

Having thus answered our *first* question, "When or in what special act, does the Church lawfully exercise her right of calling?" we proceed to the discussion of our second, viz:

Through whom does the Church lawfully and properly perform this act, or give this call to the ministerial office?

Assuming, as we have tried to prove, that *ordination* is the special act in which induction into the ministerial office occurs, or in which the Church gives the call, the question now arises by *whom* is this ordination to be administered? Through whom, as participants in the act, does the Church thus give the call? Is this ordinance of inducting into the office administered wholly by those in the office, or are others also to join with the ministry in its administration? In a word, by whom does the Church, in the act of ordination, express her judgment, and give the call to the office of the ministry?

I use the word "*ordination*," in this connection, in its widest sense, including the examination of the candidate, the decision with regard to his qualification or fitness for the office, and then the solemn ceremony or act itself consisting in the "laying on of hands" according to apostolic practice.

As is well known, there are, even among those who hold that the call should be given, not by an individual Church, but by the Church general in her representative or corporate capacity, different opinions as to the persons by whom properly this act of thus ordaining or inducting into the ministerial office should be performed. The one theory or opinion regards the ministry, or those in the ministerial office, the "*Ordo*" itself, as the only proper agent for its legitimate and right performance. The other theory or opinion regards the ministry *and* the laity, in joint synodical relation, as the proper agent or instrument by which the induction into the sacred office should be made. The one theory expresses itself in the "Formula of Government," framed by our fathers, in the words which declare: "The *Clergy* shall then hold a meeting consisting exclusively of Scripture elders, that is preachers, for the purpose of attending to those duties which Christ and his apostles enjoined upon them *alone*, viz., examination, licensure and ordination of candidates for the ministry. This meeting is called the ministerium or presbytery, by which in Scripture is meant ministers alone." (*Formula*, ch., xvii., sec, 1). The other theory expresses itself in words like the following: "It is both the right and the duty of the whole Church, through her representatives, clerical and lay, to take an active part in the discussions and decisions of all questions affecting her welfare, and among others, especially also in the great question as to who shall constitute her ministry." (EV. REVIEW, vol. xii., p. 405). And, for the practical adoption of this latter theory, whether wisely or not time will reveal, provision has been made by our General Synod in her revised constitution for District Synods, where it is declared: "In all cases where District Synods *have not made provision for a Ministerium*, all the powers and duties prescribed in this Article (on *Ministerium*) shall devolve on the Synod." (Article viii., sec. 14).

To this second theory there are, in my judgment clear and weighty objections, and the first theory therefore, which maintains that ordination is properly the act alone of the ordained, or that those only who are themselves rightly in the office can rightly induct others into it, is the theory which I

believe accords best both with the intrinsic fitness of things or essential requirements of the case, and the indications or teachings upon the subject of the word of God. The advocates of the former of these two theories, namely that the laity should also have a voice in determining who shall constitute the ministry, do not, it should in justice to them be said, ask that the immediate act of ordination itself, the laying on of hands, or the public ceremony by which the candidate is set apart to the work of the ministry, should be participated in by the laity. This they admit should be done by the ministry only. All that they demand is that the laity should sit with the clergy in the examination into the qualification or fitness for the office of the candidate, and should have a vote or voice in determining who shall be ordained. "I have not only," says one distinguished advocate of the supposed rights of the laity in the matter, "no objection to ministers ordaining ministers, but believe that it is very proper and becoming that they should do this." And another equally respected champion for lay-rights in determining who shall fill the ministerial office, uses this language: "Nor does this proposition contemplate any interference on the part of the laity with any of the prerogatives that can be clearly shown to belong to the ministry, as for instance, their right and duty to *ordain*, *i. e.* solemnly set apart to their official work, by prayer and the imposition of hands, those whom God has called, through the Church, to that department of Christian activity. Ordination is evidently set forth in the Scriptures as a presbyterial, *i. e.* ministerial act, and should therefore be performed by ministers alone. And all the opposition manifested to the proposed change, on the ground that the laity have no right to ordain, arose from an entire misapprehension of the question at issue. No claim of that kind is set up on behalf of the laity. We have no sympathy whatever with those who claim for the so-called *lay-elders* a right to participate in this solemnity." (EV. REVIEW, vol. xii., p. 403). And a more recent defender of the laity over against the ministry, upon this question of ordination, narrows the point of dispute if possible still more. "The actual point of differ-

ence," he says, "is neither who shall examine candidates for licensure, nor who shall ordain, that is perform the ceremony of induction into the sacred office. About the superior competency and the propriety of the *ministry* to conduct the examination of candidates, or about the special fitness and more orderly mode of the ministry performing the act of ordination, there is no variance of opinion. It must be borne in mind distinctly that the present is not a case of either competency, fitness, or order, but a case of inherent authority or power. The real question, then, about which there can be any dispute among those who adhere to the Lutheran view of Church polity is, to whom has been delegated primarily the authority to license and ordain." (QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. vi., p. 250).

The point at issue then, in answer to the special question now before us, namely, "Through whom does the Church lawfully and properly perform the act of ordination or give the call to the ministerial office?" is, whether the laity are entitled to take any part whatever in determining to whom the call to the office of the ministry shall be given. Does the Church in giving the call express or decide such call alone through *the ministry* as her representatives and acting in her stead, or does she do so through the joint action, as her representatives, both of ministry *and* laity?

That the true call to the office of the ministry is given only and solely through the ministry, as the divinely appointed representatives of the Church, and that the laity are entitled to no participation whatever in determining to whom it shall be given, is evident to my own mind, if not to that of others, for a number of reasons.

(1). One reason lies in the fact that the opposite view rests, in its very foundation, upon certain mere assumptions or mere half truths at best.

One of these mere assumptions or half truths is the false or one-sided view of the Church as a Republic, an ecclesiastical Democracy, in which the popular will and popular suffrage are the source of authority and power. There is, of course, some truth in this view; but, by no means, the whole truth, nor the chief and essential truth. The Church of Christ, in its essen-

tial elements, is, not a Republic, but a Kingdom. (Psalm 2:6; Dan. 7:14; Eph. 1:22-23). But if the Church is thus a *Kingdom* then the source of power and authority is not in the ruled but in the ruler, not in popular suffrage, but in the order of things as established in the very organization of the Church by the Divine King of this Kingdom; for in a Kingdom the authority does not flow from below upward, but from above downward. And this is precisely, as we think, where exists the source of authority with regard to the office and perpetuation of the ministry. If the Church is a pure Republic, a mere Democracy, then, without a single word of debate, we will freely admit that the laity shall share in giving the call to the ministry; and will also admit that they *alone* shall give it; for then, as a divine institution, there is no office of the ministry at all in the Church. But if, on the other hand, the Church is a Kingdom, and Christ is the Head and King, then is there also a government over the Church; and if there be a government then also must there, by divine appointment, be officers to whom is entrusted the exercise of the authority and functions of that government. These officers, at first appointed or commissioned by the King Himself, were the Apostles. Since the Apostles, and virtually as their successors, the officers in this Kingdom of Christ are the gospel ministry.* For whilst in the gift of

* "Our Lord before His ascension instituted the office of the *Apostolate*, having within it all the powers of the future ministry. The Apostolate had *extraordinary* and incommunicable powers and functions. It had also *ordinary* and communicable powers and functions, which were to be transmitted and perpetuated in and through the ordinary ministry to the end of the world." (Mark 3:13, 14; Matt. 10:2; Luke 6:13; Acts 1:2-25; Rom. 1:5; 1 Cor. 12:28, 29; Eph. 2:20; 2 Pet. 3:2; Rev. 21:14; 1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11; 2 Peter 1:1; 1 Tim. 1:18; 2 Tim. 1:13; 2 Tim. 2:2; Matt. 28:20; 2 Cor. 5:19). * * *

"In addition to their extraordinary or special powers and functions, the Apostles had the *ordinary* ones, common to the whole ministry, to wit: the preaching of the Gospel, conferring the sacraments, administering discipline, and ordaining others to the ministry. In each and all of these they were but fellow-presbyters, ministers, pastors and bishops with other ministers." (Acts 1:20; 5:42; 20:24; Rom.

inspiration, and in the power of working miracles, and in the ability of discerning spirits, and in some other respects, the Apostles stand alone and have no successors, yet as the commissioned and authorized expounders of the King's message, as the administrators of His sacraments, and as the possessors of the right to exercise the power of the keys, they have successors, and those successors are not a line of popes or bishops as a superior and distinct order, but the Christian Ministry, filling an office whose chief work is the preaching of the divine word. But this office, in the very nature of the case, or in view of the very fact that the Church is not a republic but a kingdom, cannot be filled by the voice and suffrage of the people, but can only be filled, either immediately by the King Himself, or mediately by those whom the King has authorized so to do in His stead. Those thus authorized are, we feel convinced, not the Church, as a mere popular assembly, but the ministry as part of the Church, acting in the name of Christ and with the authority of Christ, for the Church.

Another assumption or half-truth upon which the right is claimed for the laity to share in filling the ministerial office, is that which regards the universal priesthood of believers as the source of the ministerial office. We have already expressed ourselves freely upon this point. But this we wish yet here most emphatically to express, namely that the office

1 : 15 ; Eph. 3 : 8 ; 6 : 19 ; 1 Cor. 4 : 1 ; Matt. 28 : 19 ; 1 Peter 5 : 1 ; 1 Cor. 3 : 5 ; 2 Cor. 11 : 23 ; Col. 1 : 7, 23-25 ; John 21 : 16).

“In their extraordinary powers and functions, the Apostles had no successors. In their ordinary ones all true ministers of Christ are their successors. There is a ministerial succession unbroken in the Church; but there is no personal succession in a particular line of transmission. The ministry that is, ordains the ministry that comes. The ministry of successive generations has always been inducted into the office of the ministry preceding ; but the so-called apostolical succession or canonical succession does not exist, would be incapable of demonstration if it did exist, and would be of no essential value even if it could be demonstrated.” (1 Tim. 1 : 18 ; 4 : 14 ; 5 : 22 ; Acts 14 : 23 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 2 ; Titus 1 : 5).—*Thetical Statement of the Doctrine concerning the Ministry of the Gospel, by Dr. C. P. Krauth.*

of the ministry is purely and only an office of *divine* institution. Or, in the words of another: "The Christian Ministry is of direct divine appointment, and whilst the call may be mediated through the Church, it is no growth or development out of any universal priesthood. The doctrine of development or evolution, as applied to the ministry, has no more foundation in the word of God than it has in the world of nature. In both cases it tends to exclude a designing and governing Mind: in the one we must dispense with an all-wise Creator, in the other with Him who is Head over all to His Church. In the Smalcald Articles we read, not that the office of the ministry springs out of the universal priesthood of believers, but:

"We are clearly taught that the office of the ministry originates from the common call of the Apostles."

Again:

"It must be confessed, that the Church is not built upon the power of any man, but it is built upon that office which bears the confession made by Peter, namely that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, (Matt. 16 : 16); for this reason Christ also speaks unto him as a minister of that office, in which this confession and doctrine should exist; and he says: Upon this rock, that is upon this doctrine and ministerial office."

The German has, *diese Predigt und Predigamt*: the Latin, *hoc ministerium*. If the Church, according to this testimony of the Reformers, is built upon the ministry—of course Christ Himself being the chief corner stone—how can the ministry be developed as an office out of the Church? Individual ministers may spring from the bosom of the Church, and may be recognized and authorized by the Church to exercise their office in the midst of the Church, but the office itself is of divine appointment, and underlies the very existence of the Church." (QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. vi., p. 409).

Still another of these half-truths which becloud and mislead the minds of many, and which serve to produce the view that to the laity as well as to the ministry belongs the right to give the ministerial call, is the plausible sophism that the ministry

is the servant of the Church, and that the Church, in the very nature of things, should be allowed the privilege of determining who shall be its servants in the ministry. To which we answer: The ministry is, in a certain sense, the servant of the Church. It is one of the ascended Saviour's gifts to the Church, for the edifying of the Church. "For all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas." (1 Cor. 3 : 22). But, in the highest and in the supreme sense, the minister of the Gospel is not the servant of the Church at all, but purely and only the servant of Christ. "We are ambassadors for *Christ*"—"Paul, a servant of *Jesus Christ*"—"If I yet pleased men I should not be the servant of *Christ*"—"The gospel which was preached of me, is not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of *Jesus Christ*"—"Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which *the Holy Ghost* hath made you overseers;" texts which teach that the minister is not primarily the servant of the Church, but the servant of Christ. Besides, this sophism that the ministry are the servants of the *Church*, assumes that the laity alone constitute the Church; whereas the ministry and the laity together, as fellow-believers in Christ, constitute it, and hence the action of the ministry, in filling the ministerial office, although not formally authorized by the laity to do so, is nevertheless the act of the Church, done not by the whole body but by part of it, namely by the ministry, whom Christ as Head of the Church has, as we believe, authorized to act in this respect for the whole Church, as her representative and proper organ of official conduct.

(2). But we derive a *second* argument against granting to the laity a voice in determining to whom the call to the ministry shall be given, *on the ground of their evident incapacity rightly to discriminate and judge concerning ministerial qualifications*. We are well aware that to assume such a position exposes one to popular censure and even odium. But, whilst aware of all this, we still prefer to be honest and frank in the utterance of our opinion. For the piety and exalted character of the laity of our Church, and of all Protestant Churches,

we have a most profound respect, and cherish for them as brethren in Christ a most fervent Christian affection. For the intelligence, and sound practical sense, and power of wise judgment which *many* of them, scattered here and there through our Churches, possess, we also cherish a very high opinion. But still, taking the laity of any Church as a body, accepting the average degree of intelligence and discrimination which they possess, we have no hesitation to declare that they are utterly incompetent rightly to judge and decide concerning the qualifications requisite on the part of a candidate for the ministerial office. Of course this is a point which cannot well be determined by argument. But does it, we may ask, seem reasonable to expect that the lay element of our Churches would be competent judges in the case? Are not the qualifications required for admission into the ministerial office such, as in the very order of things, or in the very nature of the case, would lie outside of the study and knowledge of almost every one except those who are themselves in the office of the ministry? What reason have we to expect that laymen as a body have the ability to sit as wise and discriminating judges of a candidate's knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, of the Evidences of Christianity, of Natural and Revealed Theology, of Church History, of Pastoral Theology, of the Rules of Sermonizing, and of Church Government? And even in regard to the simple and practical subject of the candidate's personal piety, or moral and spiritual fitness for the ministerial office, how many of our laymen, in the present day, are imbued with utterly unscriptural and erroneous conceptions of conversion and of the new life of Christ in the soul, unfitting them to judge correctly, even in this respect, of a man's fitness for the work. Why, in every other profession and department of trade or business, are those, and those only, who are themselves in the profession or trade or business, set to judge, and regarded as alone competent to judge, with regard to the fitness of those applying for admission, whilst for admission into this highest of all professions, requiring the most special

qualifications, and involving the highest and most lasting responsibilities, the decision of the case is to be, in large part, submitted to those who are themselves outside of the profession, and who make no pretension to a knowledge of many or any of its requirements. Why should lawyers alone decide who shall be admitted to the practice of law, and physicians alone who shall enter the medical profession, and military men alone who shall be enrolled in the ranks of the military, and mechanics alone who shall be received into the different unions or orders of mechanics, those *in* each profession and no others, weighing the qualifications and deciding as to the fitness of those who apply for admission, and yet the ministry be denied the right and privilege of determining who shall be admitted into the office of the ministry? Why should this be pressed as an exception? Why, in this case, and in this case alone, should those not in the profession be made judges of men's fitness for the profession? The demand, upon the very face of it, bears the evidence of its own unreason and impropriety, and merits prompt and most emphatic refusal.

If the lay element sent up to our synodical assemblies by the churches were always the wisest and most discerning men in the churches, selected and sent because of their superior wisdom and power of discernment, our opposition, on this ground of incompetency, to allowing the laity a voice in determining to whom the ministerial call should be given, would, we admit, be largely modified, although even then, upon other grounds, we would still oppose it. But to those of us who know that the direct reverse is the case, that men are thus sent without regard whatever to intelligence or ability for their mission, but often simply to please and humor them, or because they often are the only ones whom the pastor can secure to accompany him, and to those of us who have noted the appalling stupidity and mental vacancy of many of the laymen who make up our synodical roll, we feel that it would be a most fearful violation of every thing sacred and right, degrading the ministerial office and imperiling the interests of the Gospel and cause of Christ, to accord

to any such element even the faintest voice in determining to whom shall be given the call to the high and holy office of the ministry. And hence, not by ministers *and* layman, and not by *Synods*, composed of the latter as well as the former, but by ministers *only*, assembled purely as a Ministerium, should the Church give the call to the ministerial office!

(3). A *third* argument, however, against granting to the lay element of the Church any part whatever in determining to whom the ministerial call should be given, may be derived from the fact that this is the judgment and practice of the Protestant Church generally. In itself this, of course, would not constitute a valid argument; for there is a possibility, although by no means a probability, that in this respect the general judgment and practice might be unscriptural and erroneous. But it still has some force as an argument and helps to confirm what other arguments serve to establish. Instead, therefore, of abolishing the Ministerium, as the organ by which to examine and ordain men into the office of the ministry, and entrust such examination and ordination to a Synod composed of laymen as well as of ministers, as has been claimed, on the ground that such a step would place us as a Church "in an attitude of desirable conformity to the faith and usages of our Protestant brethren," we find that by doing so we would really be sundering ourselves from them, and would be departing from the judgment and practice of the Church general in this respect. Neither in the Methodist Episcopal, in the Presbyterian, in the Congregational, nor in the Protestant Episcopal Church, do laymen, as laymen, have either voice or vote in determining who shall be admitted into the ministerial office. In all these large and intelligent denominations, the ministry alone rightly determine to whom the ministerial call shall be given. For, as Dr. Hodge correctly says, "It is a principle which is universally admitted by all denominations of Christians, except the Independents, that the right to ordain to any office in the Church belongs to those who hold that office, or one superior to it, and which includes it." And again: "If then it is admitted that ministers and ruling elders hold different offices;

and if, as has been clearly shown from the constitution, ordination confers office, the inference seems unavoidable that those only who hold the office of a minister of the Gospel can confer that office upon others. Presbyterians deny the right of ordination to the civil magistrate; they deny it, under ordinary circumstances, to the people; they deny it to any who have not themselves been invested with the office conferred." Again: "Presbyterial ordination is ordination by a presbyter or presbyters, and not by a presbytery, in our technical sense of the term. This is surely the doctrine of the Scriptures, and the only doctrine on which we can hold up our heads in the presence of prelacy," (*Church Polity*, pp. 273, 275, 293).

The position, then, which we take, in thus excluding the laity from any direct part in the admission of men into the office of the ministry, is not a singular one, but is the position which, for good reasons, has been adopted by a number of the largest and most intelligent denominations which, to-day, compose Protestant Christendom. The judgment of them all is that it is both right in principle and expedient in practice that those only who are themselves in the ministry should exercise the right of calling others into the ministry.

(4). A *fourth* argument, however, in favor of our position, that ministers only should give the call to the ministerial office we derive from the fact that this, we believe, notwithstanding all that has been cited and written to the contrary, is the position which our Lutheran Confessions and the writings of our greatest Lutheran dogmaticians, honestly and impartially interpreted, really maintain.

As is well known, there are, according to our leading Lutheran writers, in the Church, three estates or orders, namely the ecclesiastical, the political, and the domestic, or the Presbytery, the Magistracy, and the Laity, to each of which three estates or orders, as part of the Church, belongs some share in the provision and settlement of pastors.

Without entering into any discussion of the correctness of this division of the Church into these three estates, and of this conclusion that to each thus belongs the right to share

in providing the Church with a ministry, yet one thing is manifest, namely that our Lutheran confessors and dogmaticians had clear conceptions of what was, in the calling of men into the ministry, the proper and special part, according to their judgment, of each of these three estates; and that, according to their judgment, the duty of examining candidates for the ministry, deciding upon their qualifications, and then by ordination inducting them into the sacred office, was purely and only the work of the first of these three estates, (*Status Ecclesiasticus*) or the ministry.

This Article (XIV.) of the Augsburg Confession, whilst very strongly declaring that no one shall perform the duties of the ministerial office without a right call to the office, does not, it is true, declare *by whom this call shall be given*. The *vocatio*, it declares, is necessary. No one can make himself a member of the estate or ministerial order. It must be done, in the name of the Church, by others. But it does not definitely state by whom. And yet Melanchthon, in his explanation afterward of the Article in the *Apology*, indicates, we think, clearly by whom, in his judgment, this call to the ministry by ordination should be given, and by whom only it should be given. According to that explanation he was willing, if only it was recognized as merely *auctoritate humana*, to abide by the order then prevailing, *i. e.* to accord to the Romish bishops exclusively the right of ordaining to the ministry, thus even depriving the ministry, as a class, of the right, and much more, of course, depriving the laity of the right. The addition, also, which he afterward makes in the *Variata*, in the words “*sicut et Paulus praecipit Tito, ut in civitatibus Presbyteros constituat*,” confirms the view that the “*rite vocatus*” demanded by the Fourteenth Article of the Confession, could, according to Melanchthon’s opinion, be given only by the ministry or by those themselves in the order, as was Titus to whom Paul thus gave command to ordain others into it. It should, also, as Bilmar (*Die Augsburgische Confession erklärt von A. F. C. Bilmar*, p. 131) well says, “be noted that the Confession, in harmony with the passages from the preface relating thereto,

assumes the words "*Kirchen-regiment*," or "*Church Government*," and "*Ordo*" to be synonymous, thereby unequivocally excluding from church government him who has not the "*Ordo*," *i. e.* lay-men. Spiritual things such as the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and the power of the keys, appertain to the *Ordo* only, and to no one else, no one except the *Ordo* having anything to say in regard to them."

Article XXVIII. of the Confession will help us to determine what were Melancthon's precise views upon the point now under consideration. He there expresses himself distinctly. "The bishop's (*i. e.* ministers) office, according to divine right, is therefore to preach the Gospel, to remit sins, to judge of doctrine, etc." But, if it is thus in general the especial duty of the ministry "to judge of doctrine," it surely also is "to judge of the doctrine" as held by those seeking a call from the Church to preach.

As far, therefore, as we can gather from the Confession itself, or from the Apology, the confessors designed by the Fourteenth Article of the Augustana to teach that the call to the office of the ministry should only be given by the ministry. And, if the question be asked, why did they not clearly state that this was their sense of it, we reply: There was no *necessity* to do so. "This particular point was not in dispute. At that time no one questioned the right and propriety of candidates for the ministry being examined by those already in the holy office." (QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. vi., p. 85).

Upon this subject of the call to the ministry Luther has written much, and not always, we are compelled to add, with as much clearness and self consistency as could be desired. As may be seen in quotations from his writings, presented in preceding parts of our lecture, and in many others which might be given, especially the well known language of the Smalcald Articles bearing upon this point, he has clearly expressed the opinion that "*churches, i. e.* local congregations, possess the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers"—that "wherever there is a true *Church* there is also the power to elect and ordain ministers"—that "the true Church be-

cause it alone possesses a priesthood, must also have power to choose and ordain ministers." And yet in the interpretation of this language of Luther, in order to ascertain precisely what his views were, we must do two things. We must, first, grasp clearly the point under dispute in connection with which he uses such language. We must ask: What is the scope or aim of it? To any one who will do this it will become manifest that Luther, in the use of such language, always employs it, not to assert that the *people*, and *not* the ordained ministry, or that the people together *with* the ordained ministry, should examine, vote upon, and ordain men into the office of the ministry, for that is never the point disputed, but to assert, over against the hierarchical claims of Rome, that the people and not the bishops shall have the right to determine who shall be their ministers or pastors. "The Reformers were protesting against the right of the popes and bishops to deprive the churches of proper teachers or ministers, and arrogate to themselves the exclusive authority to make and appoint priests at their pleasure, without the consent of churches and regardless of their welfare." And then we must, secondly remember that when Luther thus asserts the right of Churches to give the call to the office of the ministry, he guards or cautions carefully against the *exercise* of this inherent right except *in case of necessity*; and he "reminds those who would pervert his teachings that he has said such things only *of extreme necessity*." Bearing these two things steadily in mind, even Luther's strong assertions, seemingly favoring the opposite view, can all, we believe, be harmonized with the position that the ordained ministry alone should admit men into the ministry.

What the testimony of the leading dogmaticians of our Church is upon this point is familiar to us all. Availing myself of the labors of others, I cite the following extracts in proof of the position for which I am contending:

CHEMNITZ, L. T. (*De Ecclesia*, iii., p. 123): "It is certainly and clearly evident both from the commands and examples of Scripture (Tit. 1 : 5 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 2 ; Acts 14 : 22) that *those who are already in the ministry, and profess*

the sacred doctrine, should be employed whenever through a mediate call the ministry is entrusted to any one. * * Therefore the election and call of ministers of the Church should not be submitted either to the ministers alone, or to the magistrates alone, or to the ignorance and inconsiderateness of the promiscuous multitude alone."

GERHARD, L. T. (*De Min. Eccl.* § 85): "That bishops and presbyters are to be employed when the ministry is to be entrusted to any one, is evident both from the apostolic command and approved examples of scripture. The same is confirmed by clear reason. For those who have been previously engaged in the ministry, and who profess the sound doctrine, can judge most correctly concerning the qualifications of those who are to be called to the office of teaching."

Ib. (86): "Speaking generally, and to give an example, we may say that the examination, ordination, and inauguration belong to the *Presbytery*; the nomination, presentation and confirmation to the *Christian Magistrate*; and the consent, vote and approval, or, according to circumstances, the demand, to the *People*. Therefore the general principle that pastors should be called with the consent of the Church, or that no one should be obtruded upon the Church when it is unwilling, has express testimonies in scripture, and was approved by the constant practice of the primitive Church; but the form of the election *in specie* varies, for sometimes the vote of the people was necessary in nominating persons, and sometimes their approval was required for those before nominated." (Acts 1 : 15, 23, 26 ; 6 : 3 ; 14 : 23 ; 1 Cor. 16 : 3 ; 2 Cor. 8 : 19 ; 1 Tim. 3 : 7 ; 5 : 22 ; 4 : 14).

QUENSTEDT, T. D. P. (*De Min. Eccl.*, iii., 402): "Each part of the Church has its own functions in the calling of ministers. It is the office of the clergy to examine the candidates for the ministry, to inquire into their learning and life, to consider and judge concerning the gifts necessary for the ministry of the Church, and to inaugurate them by the laying on of hands. It belongs to the Christian magistrate to nominate them, to present them when called, and to ratify their examination. The duty of the people is to give the call, to approve by their vote and testimony, and to elect."

HOLLAZIUS, (*Examen De Min. Ecc.*, q. vii. Prob. b.): "The call of ministers generally and comprehensively considered (as embracing election, ordination, and the call specially so called) should be so attended to by the whole Church, and all its three orders, that due order be preserved and confusion be avoided. Therefore the examination, ordination and inauguration belong to the *presbytery*, the nomination, presentation and confirmation to the Christian magistrate, and the consent, vote and approval to the people."

HUNNIUS, (782): "To ministers belongs the right of ordaining ministers."

Now, we have made these quotations from the writings of our leading dogmaticians for a single purpose, viz., to show that whatever part, in the giving of the ministerial call, they may assign to the magistracy or to the people, the part of examining, ordaining and inducting into the office they unanimously accord alone to the ministry. If necessary many other extracts might be added to these which we have thus given, making this point clear beyond all possibility of denial. The existence, therefore, of a *Ministerium*, by whom alone the induction of men into the ministerial office shall be performed, is, we believe, thoroughly Lutheran or in entire harmony with the views of the leading Lutheran dogmatic writers. And with such an arrangement, even under our American republican form of government, each of the three estates or orders, according to these old dogmaticians, literally exercises its proper right or part in the giving of the call. The magistracy, instead of directly exercising its right, delegates the exercise of it to the other two estates or orders. The ministry examine and ordain or call into the office. And the people elect or choose their own pastors, thus confirming the judgment and act of the ministry. And thus, in this related and joint act of the state the ministry and the people, the Church, which embraces them all, gives the ministerial call.

(5.) A final argument, however, and the most weighty of all, in favor of our position, that to the ministry alone belongs the right to give the call to the ministry, we base upon

the fact that this, we believe, is *the position, or teaching, of the word of God.*

Of course, the very question in dispute is: What does the word of God teach concerning the matter? What is, according to the Scriptures, the right method of perpetuating the ministry? What was the precise order of procedure in the induction of men into the ministerial office employed by the apostles and the primitive Church? According to the principles and practices found in the Bible, is the investment of men with ministerial authority the act properly alone of the ministry, or is it the joint act both of the people and ministry? Or, drawing the lines still closer, even where it is evident that the act of inducting into the sacred office was performed by the ministry alone, was it thus performed by power and authority vested in them, as the incumbents of the office, by Christ the Head of the Church, or was it performed by power and authority delegated to them by the Church, as the act of the Church whose official representatives they, for the time being, were?

To these questions, by men equally eminent for ability and piety, directly opposite conclusions have been reached and opposite answers have been given. To some, viewing the question in the light of God's word, it is clear that *the ministry alone*, by divine authority, and to the entire exclusion of the laity, possess the authority to make ministers or to give the call to the ministerial office; and to others, viewing the subject in the same light, it is equally clear that the true call to the ministry is the act of the Church, *embracing both the ministry and the laity*, and hence that even when the act is wholly performed by the ministry, it is yet thus performed, not as the separate and independent act of the ministry, as having in itself divine authority so to do, but as the act of the Church, having in itself by divine bestowal the authority to call, but delegating to the ministry, because of its greater competency, the exercise of this authority.

The Scriptures therefore do not, we may assume, with entire clearness, and beyond room for controversy, determine by whom precisely this call to the ministry is to be given.

Our judgment, however, is that the weight of Bible testimony is very decidedly in favor of the position that the ministry is a purely self-perpetuating institution in the Church; being itself part of the Church and officially representing the Church, and yet deriving its authority not from the Church but from Christ the divine Head of the Church. The right, therefore, to give the call to the ministry is one which, we believe, belongs wholly and only to the ministry, and this not as a delegated right from the Church but as a divinely conferred right from Christ. We are willing to adopt as our own the views expressed by Löeche, (*Aphorismen über die Neutestamentlichen Aempter*, p. 71): "The office stands in the midst of the Church like a fruitful tree that has its seed in itself. As long as the examination and ordination remain in the hands of the presbyterium or pastors it is right, and can be maintained that it completes itself, and propagates itself from person to person and from generation to generation. Those who hold it pass it along, and he to whom its incumbents transfer it, holds it as from God. The office is a stream of blessing that pours itself from the Apostles upon their disciples, and from these onward into future times." Or we accept the declaration of Grabau (*Der Missouriische u. Iowanische Geist und die Lehre der Lutherischen Kirche*, p. 20): "As Christ is the only Lord and ruler of His Church, and as such has given the holy ministry, the Gospel and the sacraments, and has thereby established for Himself an office of the ministry, so church government (Kirchen-regiment) does not rest upon the relinquishment of rights or upon regulations made by the multitude, but primarily upon the faithful service of the pastors and the ministers of God's word, from which goes forth the faith and the life of the congregation."

This position that the ministry is thus a self-perpetuating office, and is such by divine appointment and arrangement, and not by any delegated authority from the Church to the ministry to act in its name and as its organ, is, we believe, thoroughly in accord with the teachings of the word of God.

Our Blessed Saviour, shortly before His ascension into Heaven, instituted, in a formal and authoritative manner, the

apostolic office. In the commission which He then gave the eleven He said: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," or end of the "age," *i. e.* of this present dispensation or Christian age: *ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*. Looking at this commission we find that its duties consisted of the following three particulars: *μαθητεύειν, βαπτίζειν, and διδάσκειν, i. e.* 1. To disciple all nations, or convert them to the faith; 2. To initiate them into the Church by baptism; and 3. To instruct them, when baptized, in the doctrines and duties of a Christian life. (*Bloomfield in loc*).

But this, as we all know, is substantially the work also of the ministry. Essentially, therefore, the apostolic office and the ministerial office are the same office. The apostles, in certain well defined gifts and duties, necessary and devolving upon them in their especial work of founding or planting the Church, of course stand alone and have, as we have already said, no successors. But in so far as the special duties are concerned which their commission, which was their call to the office, details, and which the Saviour laid upon them as their official life-work, they have legitimate and true successors in the gospel ministry. The functions to be performed both by the apostles and by the ministry are in substance, or in their essential character, the same, and hence the office in both is essentially also the same. (*Ev. Rev.*, vol. xi., p. 320).

A further examination, however, of this apostolic commission reveals the additional fact that it was not addressed by the Saviour to the apostles simply as individuals, to be limited to them, and to terminate with them, but it was addressed to them, *as the incumbents of an office*, which was to continue after them, and which was to take up and carry on the work which they thus, under the Saviour's command and direction, began. The very terms of the commission disclose that this is its character. "He commands, in the first place, to go into all the world; for the purpose, in the second place,

of preaching the Gospel to every creature; assured, in the third place, that He is with them always, and even unto the end of the world. Either of these propositions, or all of them together, most positively precludes the idea that this language of the Saviour was addressed to the apostles in their merely *individual* capacity; for neither did they, nor could they themselves go into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature, and unto *the end of the world* be assured that Christ was with them in authority and power." (EV. REVIEW, vol. xi., p. 327).

And yet this commission thus to disciple all nations by baptizing and by teaching, or by the performance of ministerial functions, is specifically addressed by the Saviour to *them*, the Eleven, and not to the general body of believers, or to the people with them as constituting together the Church.

The conclusion, therefore, it appears to us, is inevitable that the words of the commission were not only an investiture of the apostles with divine authority themselves to enter the ministerial office, but also to call others into it; *i. e.* to perpetuate the office, so that after them those whom they had chosen and ordained as their successors might carry on the work which they had thus begun. They themselves, by the very terms of the commission, were, without the co-operation of the general body of believers, authorized by the Saviour both to be ministers and to call or make ministers. As Prof. Worley, expresses it: "The only logical deduction that can be made from the passage (Math. 28 : 16-20) is that it was addressed to the Eleven as those from whom, until the end of time, yet under Christ, in themselves and in those to whom they committed the authority by the will of Christ, the office of preaching should go forth, bearing in its hands the gracious blessing of salvation to the whole perishing world, and until the Church militant is completely taken up into the Church triumphant." (EV. REVIEW, vol. xi., p. 328).

And this deduction, as the same writer further shows, is confirmed by the entire subsequent practice or acts of the Apostles. Instead of referring the appointment of ministers, either wholly or in part, to the people, or to the whole con-

gregation of believers, they, there is clear proof, at least in many, if not in all instances, assumed the authority thus to appoint all to themselves, thus showing that they had in their commission been invested by the Saviour with such authority, "that Christ *intended* it so to be, viz.: that the authorization of public teachers in the Church should proceed from those whom He had appointed already to the office."

In evidence of this let us examine some of the passages bearing upon the subject.

Take first the passage found in Acts 14 : 23; referring to the ordination of elders by Paul and Barnabas in the churches which they had founded and were then revisiting and confirming in the faith. "And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed." *Χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*, i. e. they appointed or placed over these churches elders or pastors who might lead and direct them—not *one* elder in each church, but *several* elders in each: *πρεσβυτερους*. *Χειροτονεῖν* signifies: *to raise the hands; to vote, elect, by stretching out the hands*. The expression has by some therefore been taken to mean that these elders were elected or chosen first by the vote of the people, expressed by the uplifting of the hand, and that this election thus expressed was then afterward ratified by the apostles by the laying on of hands or ordination. This is the view of the passage taken by Chemnitz: "Paul and Barnabas," he says, "ordained elders in every church established by them. But they did not assume the right and authority exclusively of electing and installing pastors; but Luke uses the word *χειροτονήσαντες*, which (2 Cor. 8 : 19) is used concerning the election which took place by the vote of the congregation; the same being taken from a Greek usage, giving their votes by stretching forth the hand, and signifies the investing of some one with the office by votes, to designate him or give their consent." But, as *Bloomfield* (in loco) has said, this sense of the passage "requires a very strained interpretation to be put on *χειροτονήσαντες*, and one moreover which is forbidden by the *αὐτους* following."

And he adds: "There is, indeed, no point on which the most learned have been so much agreed as this, that *χειροτονησας* here simply denotes "having *selected, constituted, appointed*. See Hammond, Whitby, Wolf, and especially Kuinoel." And Olshausen says: "The expression in verse 23 is a peculiar one, *χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους, electing for them elders*." "It does not," he adds, "permit us to suppose there was a free choice on the part of the church, but intimates that the Apostles *themselves* sought out the parties qualified for office." This ordaining of elders or pastors by Paul and Barnabas was then, we hold, according to the natural and grammatical sense of the text, the act of the Apostles themselves, and does not include in any way the active participation of the congregation. We may suppose, of course, that the congregation fully acquiesced in the choice and ordination which the apostles thus made, and heartily and gladly accepted those thus ordained as their pastors, but there is, we maintain, no basis whatever in the text for the inference that the congregation first chose them as pastors, or by election gave them the ministerial call, and that the apostles then afterward simply by ordination confirmed or ratified that call.

But, take next the passages (2 Tim. 1 : 6 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 14) which refer to the ordination or induction into the ministerial office of Timothy, and it already appears that, not the people, but the ministry performed the act. In Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy (1 : 6) he puts him in remembrance to "stir up the gift of God which is in him by the putting on of Paul's hands," and therefore also commands him to "hold fast the form of sound words" which he had heard of Paul, thus showing that Paul, by virtue of the grace given him of the Lord Jesus in bestowing upon him the office of an apostle, had also instructed Timothy and had appointed him to the holy office. And that Paul, in thus ordaining Timothy to the ministerial office, had not acted alone, nor with the consent or suffrage or co-operation of any congregation, but in *Ministerium*, or along with other teachers and pastors or fellow presbyters, is evident from the language (1 Tim. 4 : 14) where he writes: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given

thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*." *Toῦ πρεσβυτερίου*: "the eldership of that district to which Timothy belonged laid hands on him," says Wiesinger. "Con-fraternity of presbyters, at the place where Timothy was ordained (perhaps Lystra) who conjointly with the apostle laid their hands on him," says Ellicott *in loc.* Wholly and only by the ministry, then, was Timothy examined, chosen, ordained, or inducted into the ministry.

Look now, in the next place, at the directions which Paul gives both to Timothy and to Titus with regard to the ordination of men to the ministry, and the position for which we are contending becomes yet more manifest. From the directions thus given, two things are evident, viz.: first that the apostles authorized those whom they ordained to ordain others and thus perpetuate the ministerial office, and secondly that they *alone* were thus authorized to ordain. Paul writes to Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, ('one in one city, many in many'—Bp. Taylor—quoted by Ellicott *in loc.*) as I had appointed thee." How absolutely *individual* is not here the apostolic direction and authorization! How free from even the faintest intimation of such a thing as "the voice of the congregation," or "ordaining by the consent or order or authority of the congregation!" To Titus personally was the apostolic authority accorded, and by him personally, governed by his own judgment in each case, was that apostolic authority also to be exercised. To Timothy the Apostle gives in substance the same directions: "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus; and the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2: 1–2). And again (1 Tim. 5: 22) he solemnly charges him: "Lay hands suddenly on no man," *i. e.* that he should not ordain any man to the ministerial office with undue haste, or without first becoming thoroughly acquainted with him and well assured of his entire fitness for it. And here again the authority to admit to the ministerial office, as

in the directions to Titus, is entirely personal. Timothy, as an ordained minister, has full authority given him to ordain others; and there is again not the slightest intimation that this authority is to be exercised only in connection with or at the request of some congregation! And "when to all this we add the fact that, in connection with these directions thus to set apart teachers, as he himself had set them apart, Paul gives both to Timothy and Titus the particular qualifications which they are to look for in proper candidates for the holy office, and commands them to use great circumspection in the exercise of this right, we have the strongest scriptural assurance as to what construction the Apostles placed upon the authority with which Christ invested them and the course which they took in its exercise." (EV. REVIEW, vol. xi., p. 329).

But there are other passages which are often cited, and which, we are told, clearly prove that ordination or the call to the ministry was *not* thus the independent and exclusive act alone of the ministry, but was the joint act of the ministry and the laity, or the act of the whole Church. The people, we are told, gave the call by electing whom they would as their pastors, and this congregational choice was then subsequently confirmed in the ordination by the ministry of those whom the people or congregation had thus called: *i. e.* that the people had a voice or vote, and indeed a very controlling one, in determining who should be admitted to the ministerial office, or to whom the ministerial call should be given.

The passage, *e. g.*, in Acts 6 : 2-3, is often thus cited. We confess, however, with all possible respect for the judgment of those who thus cite it, that we are unable to discover the least pertinency or relevancy in it to the question at issue. The election of those seven men to serve as officers in the church at Jerusalem was a purely congregational matter, and, of course, the members of the congregation were entitled to a voice in its determination. They were laymen *before* they were thus chosen and set apart as deacons, and they were, so far as that affected them, equally laymen *afterward*. Several

of them, it is true, did subsequently become preachers of the Gospel, or incumbents of the ministerial office, but they did not become such by this election and ordination. In this transaction, in which, it is freely admitted, the people elected and the apostles then appointed or set apart by the laying on of hands, they were merely elected and set apart to attend to a certain expressed and well defined congregational or local work, viz. to administer rightly what is called "*the daily ministration,*" to "*serve tables,*" to take charge, as we read, of "*this business.*" The passage therefore, we hold, is utterly irrelevant to the point at issue, and hence proves really nothing either way with regard to the question whether the people, in apostolic days, had a voice in determining to whom the ministerial call should be given.

Another of the passages constantly cited by the advocates of the right of the laity to take part in the bestowal of the ministerial call in favor of their position, is the passage, Acts 15, containing the record of the Council or Synod which was held at Jerusalem to adjust or determine the question whether circumcision, under the Christian dispensation, was a condition of salvation, which had been referred to it by the church at Antioch. Laymen, we are confidently told, "were present at this first ecclesiastical council, and took an active part in all its proceedings;" and, on the assumption that all this was, beyond a doubt, really so, we are further and frequently told that thus also should it now and always, in all ecclesiastical conventions, be, and especially in all those in which the Church determines so important a matter as the matter to whom the call to the office of the ministry should be given. But here again, as in the preceding citation, there are a number of things unproved and merely assumed, upon which however the entire argument is founded, and in consequence of which the whole conclusion is therefore invalidated. What real proof, *e. g.*, is there that "*the certain other of them*" who are mentioned as coming up with Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem were lay delegates from the church at Antioch? What real proof is there that a single layman uttered a word or cast a ballot in the council or synod? What real proof

indeed is there even of the presence of a layman in the council or synod, in an official capacity, or as constituting an official and authoritative part of the council or synod? We are bold to say that not one of these things, can from the passage, be clearly and satisfactorily *proven*. To us it is evident that the only parties actively participating were the commissioners Paul and Barnabas and the "certain other of them," most probably elders or ministers from Antioch, and the elders and apostles at Jerusalem. These, we believe, were the only active participants in the proceedings. Paul and Barnabas were sent, not to confer with the multitude, but to confer with "*the apostles and elders* about this question;" and we read (v. 6) "and *the apostles and elders* came together for to consider of this matter." And whilst the sessions were evidently open to the congregation, and large numbers of the people were present, (v. 12) and whilst after the deliberations and decisions it is said, "then pleased it the apostles and elders, *with the whole Church*, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas," and whilst we also read: "the apostles, and elders and *brethren* send greeting unto the brethren," still there is no proof that others than apostles and elders actually participated, and what is spoken of as thus having been the pleasure and message of "the whole church" and of "the brethren," may all be harmonized with what precedes upon the assumption that the apostles and elders acted in the case, so far as the church was concerned, *representatively*, i. e. in the name of the Church. "The whole plea," writes another, "of the lay participation turns on the terms "*the whole Church*," and "*brethren*." In regard to the first of these terms it occurs in connection with their resolving to send chosen men to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and the other is rendered doubtful by the reading of the best manuscripts. The famous Codex Sinaiticus is against the term "*brethren*" as referring to persons separate from the apostles and elders. In this view Alford concurs. We have, then, little more than the shadow of a shadow of any active participation of the laity in this so-called synod, and, if they did have any participation, it still

has no bearing on the question at issue. For, it was a question, not of the ministry, but one affecting every member of the Church, and in which every lay member had direct and personal interest." (QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. iii., p. 102).

But the *locus classicus* with those who regard the laity as entitled to participation in the admission of men to the office of the ministry, is the record (Acts 1 : 15-26) of the election and ordination of an apostle to take the place of Judas who, "by transgression, fell, that he might go to his own place." "Here," we are told with an air of triumph, "we have even the choice of an apostle by the multitude of the disciples, the whole Church participating;" and *a fortiori*, if the laity thus had part in the election or choice of an apostle, should they not now have the same in the call to the office of the ministry?

This choice of a successor to Judas, upon which they lean so heavily for support of their position, will not, we are satisfied, if it is carefully and impartially considered, furnish them even the least reliable and satisfactory support. In the first place, the validity of the whole proceeding may very properly be questioned. The fact that of Matthias, thus elected to the apostleship, no further record whatever exists in scripture; the fact that this election took place before the special outpouring of the Holy Ghost, on the day of Pentecost, for which the apostles had been commanded by Christ to wait, thus making this a hasty act, performed, if not against the command of Christ, yet, at least, without it; the fact that Christ Himself afterward chose Paul as one of His inspired apostles; and the fact that in the Apocalypse (21 : 14) only *twelve* apostles are spoken of, in harmony with the original number constituting the apostolic college; all these facts make it more than probable that this entire transaction was unauthorized, unapproved, and invalid. But admitting for the sake of argument, its validity, we deny, in the second place, that there is proof in the record that there really was, in the strict sense of the word any such thing as an election by the suffrage of the assembled multitude. For possibly, as Dr. J. Addison Alexander suggests, the persons

thus assembled did not vote at all ; and, if there really was voting, there is nothing in the record to indicate certainly by whom it was done. Peter it should be noted, in his address (*Worley*) upon the occasion, does not call upon the whole company to take part in the choice, but merely announces to them the necessity, in accordance with prophecy, that such choice be made ; and the language in the latter part of the narrative is such that it cannot be said beyond question to include all present in the vote or lot which was cast. "It has been disputed," says Alexander, "whether it was only the eleven or the whole assembly that *gave forth their lots*. The very question assumes, either that this was an election, in the ordinary sense of the expression, or that *lots* means *votes* or *ballots*, which is entirely at variance with the usage of the word, and with the circumstances of this case. This makes it wholly unimportant who performed the mere external act of drawing, shaking or the like." (*Commentary on Acts in loco*).

Our judgment of the transaction is that it took place in the *presence* of the congregation or disciples but was not in any way performed *by* them ; that the apostle addressed them as he did, not to invite and prepare them to take part in it, but to explain to them and prepare them to witness what the apostles were then and there about to do ; that the apostles themselves, in the nature of the case, could alone know who "had companied with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning with the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from them," and that the apostles themselves therefore, and not the multitude, appointed or selected two, meeting these conditions, and that *they*, after prayer, gave forth or cast lots, thus leaving it to the Lord to show "whether of these two He had chosen to be a witness with them of His resurrection." We incline, indeed, to the opinion that the "*hundred and twenty*," or those designated by the general terms "*disciples*," in whose presence this choice of an apostle thus took place, were not the members of the church at Jerusalem at all, but were the seventy evangelists, and others representing the disciples

or Church of Christ from all parts of the land, who were then, during the season of Pentecost, present in Jerusalem and could easily thus be assembled together; so that, whilst there were yet no organized churches which they represented, or of which they were pastors, they still, in fact, were the representatives or pastors of the unorganized body of believers in various places. But, whether this be so or not, of this we feel certain that there is no evidence in the record to justify the opinion that the multitude present, whoever they may have been, took any direct part in the transaction whatever, much less that they actively participated, and by their ballots or votes decided that Matthias, and not Joseph called Barsabas, should be the successor of Judas. And hence we are also clear that no argument can justly be drawn from this transaction of thus electing an apostle, to take the place of the traitor Judas, in favor of now allowing to those not themselves in the office of the Gospel ministry to assist in deciding who shall be admitted into it.

Reviewing then, all that we have now said, under this examination of the various scripture texts bearing upon the subject, the argument appears to us conclusive, beyond room for doubt, that the word of God clearly teaches that ministers, and ministers only, should decide who shall be ministers; or, in other words, that to the ministry only has been granted the divine authority and right to give, in the name of the Church, the call to the ministerial office.

But, we proceed now to ask and answer our third and last question, viz:

What is the precise import or character of the act of ordination by which men are thus inducted into the ministerial office?

There are *three* aspects in which ordination may be considered, namely: what it is in itself, what it is as the act of the Church, and what it is as the act of the applicant or person receiving ordination. Let us look at it briefly in each of these aspects.

Ordination, considered merely as a visible or external rite, consists in the laying on of the hands of the ministry, accompanied with prayer, by which imposition of hands and prayer

the recipient is placed in the ministerial office and is clothed by the Church with authority to perform in her midst ministerial functions.

The ceremony of the laying on of hands, always employed by the Church in the ordination of men to the ministerial office, dates back as a ritual of induction into sacred positions and offices, even to the earliest ecclesiastical ages. Joshua, *e. g.*, was thus inducted, by special divine command, into the office to which he was called. (Numb. 27 : 18). Thus also were the seven deacons set apart to their offices. (Acts 6 : 6). Thus also were Paul and Barnabas set apart to their special missionary labors among the Gentiles. (Acts 13 : 3). So also in the ordination of Timothy. (1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 6). The Apostle Paul also bids Timothy "lay hands suddenly on no man," (1 Tim. 5 : 22) showing that "when he wrote these words they had become a well known expression for ordaining to a sacred office. And this mode continued to be used in the Post Apostolic Church as is evidenced by the directions and forms of prayer for ordinations in what are called the apostolic constitutions." (*Jacob's Eccles. Polity of the New Testament*, p. 110).

Whatever, then, we may regard the real import or content of ordination to be, this, at least, is clear, namely, that, as a ceremony, consisting of prayer and the laying on of hands, it possesses divine approbation if not positive divine institution, and it comes down to us clothed with the authority and endowment not only of apostolic practice but also of the continuous and unbroken practice of the Church during all the successive centuries since.

But what, let us now ask, is the import or the content of ordination, as a right of induction into the ministerial office? What is it, not as a mere external ceremony, but in its spiritual or supernatural and divine elements? What character precisely does it possess? Is it only a ceremony, or is it a ceremony in connection with which there are imparted spiritual gifts and graces? In a word, does ordination secure or give anything in the way of endowment or qualification for the office of the ministry from the Holy Ghost?

What the Romish theory concerning the essential character of ordination is, we have already seen. She esteems it as the highest and greatest of the sacraments; "sacramentum ordinis;" that sacrament by which men are fitted and endowed with power by the Holy Ghost to administer rightly all the other sacraments. "Propter ordinem," says Thomas Aquinas, "fit homo dispensator aliorum sacramentorum, ergo ordo habet magis rationem, quod sit sacramentum, quam alia."

The Greek Church takes the same view as does the Romish concerning it, declaring that "Orders are a sacrament, in which the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of the bishop's hands, ordains them that be rightly chosen to minister sacraments, and to feed the flock of Christ." (*Creeds of Christendom*, vol. ii., p. 501).

That ordination is thus a sacrament, in the strict and correct sense of the word, or in the same sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments, all Protestants heartily deny; although, in a certain wide and untechnical sense, our Lutheran confessors and dogmaticians were willing that it should be so called or designated. (*Vide Apology*, vii., 11. *Gerhard*, xii., b. 147).

But, whilst this Romish conception of ordination, as truly a sacrament, is undoubtedly an entirely extreme one, and involves a gross misapprehension of the ministerial office, and is therefore very properly rejected by all Protestant Churches and creeds, the question may still be asked whether many Protestants themselves, in their intense opposition to everything that partakes of a hierarchical principle, have not swung off into an opposite extreme, and, by making little or nothing of ordination, have also, perhaps, like the Romanists, missed the exact truth.

The views, *e. g.*, of Luther and of our earlier Lutheran dogmaticians, which assign to election by the congregation the call to the ministry, and which logically therefore regard ordination as not really necessary, and as being merely a solemn and impressive way of recognizing or publicly declaring that the person ordained has been called, and is by the call which he has already received already also in the ministerial

office, are certainly, in our judgment, thus extreme and utterly untenable when dispassionately considered in the light of God's word. We may not perhaps be able to determine and express what precisely is conferred in this ordination service by which men are inducted into the ministry, but this much to our mind is clear, that the Holy Spirit does confer spiritual gifts and graces of some kind and to some degree; in other words that whilst not in the Romish sense a sacrament, lifting the recipient up into an hierarchical order, and divinely imparting to him priestly and miraculous power or supernatural endowments which he did not before possess and which are indelible and can never be lost, yet also is it not in the extreme Protestant sense a mere ceremony, imparting as the gift of the Holy Ghost no benediction, and leaving the spiritual character and qualifications of the person ordained the same in all respects as though he had not been ordained. This latter view is also, we are satisfied, equally with the former, an unscriptural extreme. In proof that ordination by the laying on of hands and prayer is more than only an empty rite, and that the Holy Ghost does in connection with it impart spiritual blessings to the person ordained, we turn to the word of God.

It is simply a fact that in every instance recorded in the Bible of the imposition of hands, or the extension of hands, accompanied with prayer, the supposition or assumption on the part of all concerned was, not that the act was merely an impressive human ritual, but that there was also something, either good or bad, either bane or benediction, actually and really imparted. "Imposition of hands," says the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M. A. (*Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii., p. 242) "is a natural form by which benediction has been expressed in all ages and among all people. It is the act of one superior, either by age or spiritual position, towards an inferior, and by its very form it appears to bestow some gift, or to manifest a desire that some gift should be bestowed. It may be an evil thing that is symbolically bestowed, as when guiltiness was thus transferred by the High Priest to the

scape-goat from the congregation, (Lev. 16 : 21); but in general the gift is something good which God is supposed to bestow by the channel of the laying on of hands. Thus, in the Old Testament, Jacob accompanies his blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh with imposition of hands, (Gen. 48 : 14); Joshua is ordained in the room of Moses by imposition of hands, (Numb. 28 : 18; Deut. 34 : 9); cures seem to have been wrought by the prophets by the imposition of hands, (2 Kings 5 : 11); and the high priest giving his solemn benediction stretched out his hands over the people, (Lev. 9 : 22). The same form was used by our Lord in blessing, and occasionally in healing, and it was plainly regarded by the Jews as customary or befitting, (Matt. 19 : 13; Mark 8 : 23; 10 : 16). One of the promises also, at the end of St. Mark's Gospel, to Christ's followers is that they should cure the sick by laying on of hands, (Mark 16 : 18); and accordingly we find that Saul received his sight, (Acts 9 : 17) and Publius' father was healed of his fever (Acts 28 : 8) by imposition of hands."

Tracing, then, the history of the laying on of hands, as we find it recorded in the Scriptures, there was evidently, all along in its history, the supposition or belief that there was, through or by it, an actual *impartation* of something, a going forth or communication of either positive blessing or curse, a production of some real and true result.

In further confirmation of this, and especially in connection with the laying on of hands as part of the ceremony of induction into the ministerial office, let us examine carefully the precise sense of several texts bearing directly upon the subject.

Let us examine, first, the text (Numb. 27 : 18) in which Moses is commanded to ordain Joshua as his successor. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him." By some it is maintained that here there could evidently have been no communication of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands, since it is explicitly asserted that Joshua already possessed the Spirit, and because of his possession of Him he

was thus selected and ordained. "In whom is the spirit." Thus one writer (*McClintock and Strong*, vol. iv., p. 58) says: "Here it is obvious that the laying on of hands did neither originate nor communicate divine gifts, for Joshua had 'the spirit' before he received imposition of hands."

But, in opposition to this interpretation of the text, we deny that the Hebrew word (רוּחַ) Ruach here signifies the Holy Spirit as one of the Persons of the Trinity, or that there is any reference whatever in the use of the term to any supernatural or gracious work wrought by the Holy Ghost in the character of Joshua. The term evidently has reference only to the *natural* endowments of Joshua, the spirit of prudence, of courage, of energy, of force and decision of character which he was endowed with and which naturally fitted him for the leadership of the people. "Understanding,"—"Insight"—"Courage"—are the meanings given of the word, as it here stands in this text, by Fuerst in his Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Hence the expression "in whom is the spirit," does not mean "in whom is the *Holy Spirit*," but simply that in him was a natural spirit, or natural elements of character, fitting him, when once quickened and directed by the Holy Ghost, and supplemented by still other and higher gifts and graces, to be the leader of the Israelitish nation. In his ordination, by the laying on of Moses' hands, the Holy Spirit added to these natural elements of character or this natural spirit, such other spiritual elements and power as might still be needed in order entirely to qualify him for the right discharge of the duties of his position. Or, as Bush (*in loco*) remarks: "By this ceremony of the imposition of hands was signified the transfer of the office of leader of Israel from Moses to Joshua, and the communication of the requisite spiritual gifts and endowments for its right discharge;" corresponding with what is plainly taught in the parallel passage (Deut. 34 : 9): "And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, *for* (וְיָדָע==nam, γάρ, or quia, ὅτι, a causal particle) Moses had laid his hand upon him."

But, in further confirmation of this truth that in the lay-

ing on of hands in ordination there is an actual communication, to the person ordained, of a spiritual gift or power from the Holy Ghost, of some character, let us examine the two passages in Paul's letters to Timothy upon the subject. "Neglect not the gift (*μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χάρισματος*) that is in thee, which was given (*ὃ ἐδόθη σοι*) thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," (1 Tim. 4 : 14). "Wherefore, I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on off my hands, (*Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀναμιμνήσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*). The word *χάρισμα* which in both these texts is translated "gifts," and which in each designates something conferred in or through the laying on of hands, occurs, says Ellicott (1 Tim. 4 : 14) "with the exception of 1 Peter 4 : 19, only in St. Paul's Epistles, where it is found as many as fourteen times, and in all cases denotes a gift emanating from the Holy Spirit or the free grace of God. Here probably, as the context suggests, it principally refers to the gifts of *παράκλησις* and *διδασκαλία* just specified. The parallel passage (2 Tim. 1 : 6) clearly develops the force of the preposition (*ἀναζωπυρεῖν*): the *χάρισμα* is as a spark of holy fire within him which he is not to let die out from want of attention." Again: "The *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν* or *χειροθεσία* was a symbolic action, the outward sign of an inward communication of the Holy Spirit for some spiritual office (Acts 6 : 6) or undertaking (Acts 13 : 3) implied or expressed." And again: "Prophecy and imposition of hands were the two co-existent circumstances which make up the whole process, by the medium of which the *χάρισμα* was imparted." (*Ellicott on 1 Tim. 4 : 14*). Bloomfield's comment on the passage (1 Tim. 4 : 14) is as follows: "Notwithstanding that this must chiefly allude to the spiritual *gifts* which Timothy had received, it may include the ordinary *graces* of the Spirit, by which his endowments in learning would be sanctified. These were given *δια προφητείας*, *i. e.* according to prophecy; of which the passage (1 : 18) is the best commentary," prophecies probably which some of the New Testament prophets had uttered con-

cerning Timothy before he was put into the ministry. The comments of Wiessinger (*Olshausen's Commentary, in loc.*, vol. vi., p. 113) on these two related or parallel texts (1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 6) are very full, and, in our judgment, very judicious and correct. *Χάρισμα*, he says, "denotes the gift of the divine Spirit, that gift which qualifies him (Timothy) for the preaching of the Gospel, for the work of an evangelist (2 Tim. 4 : 5) and which he had to make use of at present in the service of a particular church. On the *ἐν σοί*, compare 2 Tim. 1 : 6, where the gift is represented as a spark of the Spirit lying within him, the kindling of which depends on the will of him on whom the gift is bestowed. So here, also, the use of the *χάρισμα* is made to depend on the will of Timothy. * * With respect to the *laying on of hands*, compare Acts 13 : 3, where we read that hands were laid in prayer on the apostle Paul and on Barnabas, by the prophets and teachers at Antioch, in order to separate them *for the work* to which they were called, Acts 6 : 6, where we read that, in like manner, hands were laid in prayer by the apostles on the newly elected deacons, in order to impart to them the gift of the Spirit for their ministry. It is in every case an appropriation of the gift of the Spirit in prayer, through the instrumentality of others, for a definite object, for a *work* which is undertaken, or a service which is entered upon, whether this service be marked out in a standing office or not." Again, on 2 Tim. 1 : 6, he remarks: "But, what does this *χάρισμα* denote? The term itself in its wide signification, (Rom. 1 : 11 ; 5 : 15 ; 6 : 23 ; 9 : 29, comp. with 12 : 6 ; 1 Cor. 12 : 4, seq.) leaves it undecided ; yet we may perhaps determine it from the connection, as verses 6 and 7 manifestly introduce verse 8 seq. (*οὖν*) and from the comparison of 1 Tim. 4 : 14 and 1 : 18. As there *χάρισμα* can be understood only of his definite gift for the vocation of teacher, so also here. And the whole tenor of the epistle (to which verse 6 is, as it were, the key) points to Timothy's vocation as a teacher, not to his Christian deportment, the *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν* of verse 6, in fact, assuming his *faith* as ground of the admonition to fidelity in his official calling. The reference is not to the gift of the

Spirit in general, but to the specific gift requisite for his calling; and this not, with Mack, that of *government*, but that of *evangelist*. So also Olshausen. The relative clause 'which is in thee,' etc., refers to the same act as in 1 Tim. 4 : 14, viz. : Timothy's reception of his evangelical calling by prophecy and imposition of hands. Regarding, as every unprejudiced person must do, the two passages as having a like reference, we see how groundlessly this setting apart is regarded as a consecration of Timothy to the bishopric of Ephesus, a formal inauguration to the office of priest or bishop. To any *presiding* over the Ephesian Church, or over any other Church, there is here not the slightest allusion." Dr. Van Oosterzee, on the first of these texts, (1 Tim. 4 : 14) remarks: "At his entrance on the office of teacher, Timothy received by the Holy Ghost, a special gift of high value in the exercise of his office. The office itself is not here denoted, but his divine qualification for the office, which was given through (*διά*) prophecy with the laying on of hands of the elders," (*Lange's Com. in loco*). And again, on 2 Tim. 1 : 6, he remarks: "The Apostle here, as 1 Tim. 4 : 14, alludes to the gift of the calling (*Lehrberuf*) received from God, and addresses Timothy not as a Christian simply, but chiefly as teacher."

Bearing in mind what these eminent biblical critics thus express, it appears, therefore, to us clear that in the ordination of Timothy by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, of which the apostle was one, there was, in that solemn transaction, communicated to him, by the Holy Ghost, as a special gift or *χάρισμα*, above what he before or without such ordination possessed, not sacramental or miraculous and divine power such as Romanists claim that ordination confers, but special moral or spiritual power with special regard to the distinctive work of a religious teacher or Christian minister and pastor to which he was then and there thus consecrated; a special impartation indeed of the Holy Ghost Himself by which, if he would subsequently avail himself rightly of this presence and offered power of the Holy Ghost within him, the natural endowments which he possessed would be quickened into new and increasing activity and

effectiveness, and his utterance of the truth be clothed with resistless power over the hearts and consciences of men. In a word, in his ordination, through the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, the Holy Ghost was so communicated to him as, in all respects, to qualify him for the right and for the successful exercise of the functions of the ministerial office.

Nor do we here, for a moment, in thus asserting that the Holy Ghost was imparted in ordination to Timothy by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, attach any magical or *ex opere operato* power to the mere manual or tactual act itself. The Holy Ghost is not imparted because the hands of the presbytery are thus imposed, nor through that even as a necessary outward and material medium, but He is imparted, we still hold, in connection with it, and as God's answer to the prayers and faith in the promises of His word which His Church there in that solemn hour pours out before Him.

And this even Gerhard, (xii., b. 168) although, as seems to us, quite inconsistently, admits. "We no not deny," is his language, "that, in ordination, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, necessary for the discharge of the duties of the ministry of the Church, are conferred and increased; yet meanwhile," he adds, "we make a distinction between the grace of reconciliation, or of the remission of sins, and the grace of ordination, since many receive the grace of ordination who nevertheless do not receive the grace of reconciliation; secondly, we say that the bestowal and increase of the gifts necessary for the ministry, are by no means to be ascribed to the laying on of the hands as a sacramental symbol truly so called, and divinely appointed, but to the prayers of the Church and the presbytery, to which the promise of hearing has been attached."

But, if in the case of Timothy there was such impartation, in the act of ordination, of the Holy Ghost, then also, we have every reason to think, is there now in the case of all who, possessing the requisite natural gifts and Christian character, present themselves to the ministerium or presbytery, as the proper official organ of the Church, and at their hands receive ordination. In all essential respects the cases are the same.

We like, upon this whole subject, the views of Martensen (*Christian Dogmatics*, Sect. 272) who says: "In the Lutheran Church preachers are ordained according to the apostolic method by laying on of the hands of the brethren—an emblem of the bestowment of spiritual gifts—yet we cannot rank priestly ORDERS on the same footing with the sacraments properly so called, and we cannot suppose that extraordinary gifts are connected therewith, as they were in the apostles times. And, withal, as little can we suppose that ordination is a mere ceremony in which *nothing* is conferred. For the office appointed by the Lord, in its very idea, seems to include a *power* and *authority* from the Lord Himself, and must, *to a certain extent*, be accompanied with the promises that were in an extraordinary manner fulfilled in the case of the apostles and evangelists whom our Lord sent forth. "I will give you," said Christ, "a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist," (Luke 21 : 15). From this authority, resting in the office as coming from the Lord Himself, appointing the preacher as servant, not of the Church only, but of the Lord, is developed the special priestly gift of performing the service for the building up of the fellowship, and of preaching words of warning and of comfort; a gift and an anointing that cannot be found in an orderly manner among those who lack that authority, because they possess only a subjective or human call. Although the Lutheran Church has not ventured to propound a dogma regarding priestly ordination, owing to a certain fear of the hierarchical principle, the faith nevertheless exists within her pale, that ordination is *more* than a mere ceremony, as it is also the express witness of faithful ministers, that they have ever derived new strength and energy for the work of their office *in their ordination*. It is evident that the gift of grace, lying hid in the office, does not always appear in power, but depends for its activity upon faith and continued personal and ethical endeavor. "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

What is true regarding the administration of the sacrament, that it must be conditional upon the inner state of the receiver, holds good also of ordination. It must be given to him only who possesses the inner preparation and the due qualifications for the office, and hence also Paul warns Timothy not to lay hands suddenly on any man."

But, apart from what ordination thus is in itself, it may also be considered *as the act of the Church*. As such it is, first, an act of *recognition*; in which the Church recognizes and acknowledges the applicant to possess the required scriptural qualifications for the office of the ministry. It is, secondly, an act of *committing* or *entrusting*. The Church has a divine mission; she has precious possessions and interests; she has solemn and blessed means of grace. That mission is the glory of Christ in the sanctification of the Church and the conversion of the world. Those possessions and interests are all the various activities and institutions by which she is seeking to secure and promote that glory. And those means of grace are the word and blessed sacraments. And all these, in the act of ordination, the Church gives over, as a sacred trust, to be cared for and defended and helped, in every possible way, by him whom she thus ordains. The divine word, *e. g.*, she gives into his hands, and bids him preach it in its purity and with all fidelity. The holy sacraments she entrusts to him and charges him rightly to administer them. Her history she gives him to study, to be inspired by, and to respect; her polity to know, esteem, and obey; her pure doctrine to understand, love, and, even at the peril of his life, to proclaim and defend; her institutions of learning to cherish and support; her literature to read and circulate; her system and schools of education to sustain and improve; her cause of missions and the world's evangelization to plead and pray for; all these interests, which are the interests of the kingdom of Christ, the Church, and Christ also through the Church, in that act of ordination, give over, as their solemn trust, to him whom they thus induct into the ministry. Thus Paul wrote to Timothy (2 Tim. 1: 14) "That good thing which was *committed* unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in

us ;” and in another place : “O, Timothy, keep that which is *committed* to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called : which some professing, have erred concerning the faith,” (1 Tim. 6 : 20-21). But thirdly, ordination, as the act of the Church, is an act also of *delegation* and *spiritual subjection*. She delegates to him authority to exercise in her midst the functions of the ministerial office. She commissions him, in the name of her ascended Lord, to preach the word and to administer the sacraments. And she places herself under his spiritual tuition and rule, recognizing him as the ambassador of Christ, and pledging herself to receive from his mouth and hands the word and sacraments as from the very mouth and hands of Christ Himself, even as Christ also declares : “He that receiveth you, receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me,” (Matt. 10 : 40) ; or as the apostle declares : “Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ’s stead be ye reconciled to God,” (2 Cor. 5 : 20) ; or, as he writes to the Hebrews, (13 : 17), “*Obey* them that have the rule over you and *submit* yourselves : for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief : for that is unprofitable for you.” And hence, while ministers are not a separate and superior *order*, and are not to “be *lords over God’s heritage*,” (1 Peter 5 : 3) their office still invests them with authority, and the duty of the Church is to acknowledge and submit herself obediently to that authority in so far as its exercise harmonizes with the principles of the word of God.

But ordination, we yet remark, may also be considered as *the act of the person receiving it, or of the person ordained*. As such it is a solemn act of entire consecration, if it be God’s will for life, to the special work of the ministry. Inwardly moved to it by the Holy Ghost, and now outwardly called to it by the voice of the Church, he, in the act of ordination, devotes himself, in most solemn covenant, henceforth, with all his time and power, to the one sublime work of promoting the glory of Christ in the exercise of the func-

tions of the ministerial office. It is a personal consecration ; a consecration of the whole man, body, mind, soul ; a consecration to the one single but grand work of the gospel ministry ; a consecration to it until death. Hence, whilst not believing in any priestly "*character indelibilis*" imparted in ordination, and whilst believing that demission of the ministerial office is under certain circumstances both justifiable and obligatory, we yet hold that for any one, with suitable gifts, once ordained to the ministry, and physically and mentally capable to discharge its duties, for the mere sake of gain to turn aside and engage in purely secular pursuits, is a great and soul-endangering sin. And yet how many men there are in our land, to-day, who, while still retaining the official prefix of "*Reverend*," and retaining it and publishing it as so much capital in trade, although in health and able, were their hearts right, to do good work for Christ in the ministry, are engaged in all kinds of merely secular and worldly vocations ; so that with the good lay brother out West the whole Church may to-day well pray : "From all ministerial land speculators, from all reverend life-insurance agents, from all clerical pill pedlars and patent medicine venders, from all ordained store-keepers and agriculturists, Good Lord deliver us !"

And sinful, also, beyond expression is it for those who have once, in ordination, solemnly consecrated themselves to the work of the ministry, forgetful of their solemn ordination vows, then afterward with only half heart and with but feeble devotion, to prosecute that work. So morally great is the work of the ministry in itself ; so solemn are the promises made in the assumption of the office ; so dependent the prosperity of the Church and the conversion of the world upon its faithful prosecution ; so responsible for the loss of immortal souls who perish through ministerial indifference or negligence ; so capable, with God's blessing upon the preached truth, to reach and change multitudes into the image of Christ and be the means of bringing them to the enjoyment of Christ and Heaven forever ; and so rapidly hastening, as both preacher and hearer are, to that august judg-

ment throne where we shall all be adjudged guilty or guiltless of the blood of each other's souls; oh how earnest, how entirely consecrated to his work, how fervent and unwearied and burning with zeal, yea what a very flame of holy fire, should every minister of the Gospel be! Of Richard Baxter it is said: "When he spoke of weighty soul concerns, you might find his very spirit drenched therein." Paul writes to the Romans: "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart; for I could wish that myself were accursed (separated) from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." And our Saviour Himself, unwavering in His devotion to the unselfish and sublime work of saving souls to which he had given Himself, exclaims: "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work." In each how full, how entire, the consecration! How steadfast and earnest and self-consuming their zeal! How true, in all things, to their ministerial call! Oh, that all who preach the word had such a spirit! Oh that all who bear the vessels of the Lord were also thus entirely consecrated to their holy and blessed work!

In now closing our discussion of this subject of the *Call to the Ministry* we know of no more fitting thought or language with which to do so, than we find in the following "*Suspirium*" with which Hollazius (*De Ministerio Ecclesiastico*) concludes his able discussion of the same:

Te, Deus, Pater omnis boni ordinis, Auctor ministerii sacri, sinceris humillimisque precibus obtestor, ut Hierarchiam tuam Ecclesiasticam, quam mortalium commodo sapientissime instituisti, adversus fremitum orbis et orci integram et incorruptam conserves! Da ministris tuis plantantibus et rigantibus incrementum uberrimum! Da etiam mihi ministro tuo infirmo os et sapientiam; Confer dona sanctificantia; adde animum imperterritum; largire prosperos officii successus, ut ad praescriptum verbi tui recte doceam, Sacramenta rite dispense, pie vivam, et ex hac vita tanquam ex hospitio, non tanquam ex domo, Te jubente, placide discedam.